

Estimation of the discontinuous leverage effect: Evidence from the NASDAQ order book

Markus Bibinger^a, Christopher Neely^b, Lars Winkelmann^c

^a*Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Philipps-Universität Marburg*

^b*Research Division, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis[†]*

^c*Department of Economics, Freie Universität Berlin**

Abstract

An extensive empirical literature documents a generally negative correlation, named the “leverage effect,” between asset returns and changes of volatility. It is more challenging to establish such a return-volatility relationship for jumps in high-frequency data. We propose new nonparametric methods to assess and test for a discontinuous leverage effect — i.e. a relation between contemporaneous jumps in prices and volatility — in high-frequency data with market microstructure noise. We present local tests and estimators for price jumps and volatility jumps. Five years of transaction data from 320 NASDAQ firms display no negative relation between price and volatility cojumps. We show, however, that there is a strong relation between price-volatility cojumps if one conditions on the sign of price jumps and whether the price jumps are market-wide or idiosyncratic.

Keywords: High-frequency data, market microstructure, news impact, market-wide jumps, price jump, volatility jump.

1. Introduction

Understanding the relation between asset returns and volatility is among the most enduring and highly active research topics in finance. From an economic point of view, there seems to be a consensus that stock market returns and changes in volatility should be negatively correlated.¹ The linear, inverse return-volatility relationship is usually attributed to both changes in financial leverage and a time-varying risk premium; see Black (1976), French et al. (1987), Duffee (1995), Bekaert and Wu (2000) and Bollerslev et al. (2006). In particular, the financial leverage explanation motivates labeling the purely statistical relation between stock returns and volatility as the “leverage effect.”

Estimation of the leverage effect is challenging. Aït-Sahalia et al. (2013) document that the leverage effect fades out when using data sampled at increasing observation frequencies. In the framework of the Heston model, they show that discretization errors, volatility estimates and market microstructure noise bias the naïve return-volatility correlation estimator

[†]The views expressed are those of the individual authors and do not necessarily reflect official positions of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, the Federal Reserve System, or the Board of Governors.

*Financial support by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) through CRC 649 “Economic Risk” is gratefully acknowledged.

¹Some papers define the leverage effect as the correlation between returns and the *level* of volatility. Duffee (1995) discusses the relation between the two definitions.

towards zero. Much effort has been made in recent times to introduce and reestablish the leverage effect for intraday data.

If the asset price and volatility processes have both Brownian and jump components, then the relation between returns and volatility splits into continuous and discontinuous parts. The continuous leverage refers to the relation between the Brownian components of the price and volatility processes, while the discontinuous leverage measures the covariation between their jumps.

Vetter (2012), Wang and Mykland (2014), Aït-Sahalia et al. (2017) and Kalnina and Xiu (2017) study estimators for the relation of continuous components of returns and changes in volatility. These papers document a negative and time-varying continuous leverage effect. Kalnina and Xiu (2017) show empirically that financial leverage measures like the debt-to-equity ratio or credit risk can explain the correlation of the Brownian components of 30-minute S&P 500 data.

The existence of the discontinuous leverage appears more controversial, however. Several previous studies have searched for a discontinuous leverage effect, with different results. Jacod et al. (2017) use truncated returns and increments of local spot volatility estimates to construct correlation statistics. Empirical results with one-minute S&P 500 Exchange-Traded Funds (ETF) data from 2005 to 2011 indicate little evidence for a discontinuous leverage effect. In contrast, Bandi and Renò (2016) use high-frequency S&P 500 futures from 1982 to 2009 and focus on a relatively small set of very large price jumps and a spot variance estimator based on infinitesimal cross-moments. Their parametric model estimates suggest a strong discontinuous leverage effect with correlations around -0.6 and -1. Aït-Sahalia et al. (2017) find that the discontinuous leverage for five-second Dow Jones index data from 2003 to 2013 is usually different from zero. Their empirical analysis does not recover the sign and magnitude of the discontinuous leverage, however. Finally, Todorov and Tauchen (2011) use five-minute option implied volatility index (VIX) data to evaluate volatility jumps in the S&P 500 index from 2003 to 2008. The authors find that squared jumps in the S&P 500 index are strongly positively correlated with the VIX. All the previous papers focus on stock market indexes and restrict to methods that are not robust to market microstructure noise.

This paper makes both methodological and empirical contributions. We introduce novel methods to test and estimate the covariation of contemporaneous price and volatility jumps – denoted by Aït-Sahalia et al. (2017) as the discontinuous leverage effect. Aït-Sahalia et al. (2017) derive a limit theorem for the discontinuous leverage estimator only in the setting without noise. However, as Christensen et al. (2014) point out, it is important to use noise-robust methods and thereby to avoid downsampling of the data to lower observation frequencies. Downsampling results in spurious jump detection and may affect the consistency of discontinuous leverage estimates. Using noise-robust estimators for jumps in log prices and volatility, we establish a stable central limit theorem under market microstructure noise for the discontinuous leverage effect for finite activity price jumps or large jumps of an infinite active jump component. We provide a consistent asymptotic test for the presence of the discontinuous leverage effect.

Our methods provide new empirical evidence about the discontinuous leverage effect for 320 individual stocks actively traded at the NASDAQ stock exchange from 2010 to 2015. We find no prevalent evidence of an unconditional discontinuous leverage effect in individual stock data, but we identify two different forces that prevent significant unconditional discontinuous leverage estimates: First, while downward price jumps are usually negatively correlated with contemporaneous volatility jumps, upward price jumps are positively correlated with contemporaneous volatility jumps. Second, although market-wide price jumps are strongly correlated with contemporaneous volatility jumps, idiosyncratic price jumps are only weakly related with contemporaneous volatility jumps. We establish an economically and statistically significant relation between cojumps in stock prices and volatility by conditioning on the sign of price jumps and whether they are market-wide or idiosyncratic. We show that firms' debt-to-capital ratio does not explain much of the cross-section of discontinuous leverage estimates or the correlations of price-volatility cojumps.

To estimate the discontinuous leverage in this paper, we only use the physical measure, i.e., observed stock prices. We first estimate the price jumps and the contemporaneous change in the spot volatility process. Two local methods to identify price jumps from noisy returns are presented. We review the Lee and Mykland (2012) method that extends the Lee and Mykland (2008) approach to a model with market microstructure noise. We generalize their stable central limit theorem for local jump estimates from a jump diffusion to more general semimartingale models. The method by Lee and Mykland (2012) is attractive because it relies on quite simple average statistics. Using spectral local statistics, we derive a superior estimator that attains the same rate of convergence with a smaller variance. To estimate spot volatility, we employ the efficient techniques recently proposed by Bibinger and Winkelmann (2016). In a second step, we follow Aït-Sahalia et al. (2017) in estimating the discontinuous leverage as the quadratic covariation of the price-jump estimates and the contemporaneous volatility jumps. We also compute correlations of price and volatility jumps to compare across stocks.

Our failure to find an unconditionally negative discontinuous leverage effect is consistent with the asset pricing models of Pástor and Veronesi (2012, 2013) in which specific events trigger jumps. That is, the continuous leverage effect and the discontinuous leverage effect are fundamentally different in that model. Their learning model implies that changes in monetary or government policy trigger market-wide price and volatility cojumps, where the uncertainty about the impact of a new policy regime on the profitability of private firms always raises volatility, regardless of the effect on prices. News that causes asset prices to jump up while causing volatility to jump down is incompatible with their model. The failure to find an unconditional discontinuous leverage effect is also consistent with the intertemporal capital asset pricing model (ICAPM; Ang et al. (2006)) in which only systematic—not idiosyncratic—volatility movements are priced. As the ICAPM implies, we find no systematic relation across stocks between idiosyncratic price and volatility cojumps.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the model and assumptions. Section 3 presents the price jump estimators, spot volatility estimation and the discontinuous leverage estimator. The spectral approach for price jumps is compared with the Lee and Mykland (2012) pre-average estimator. Section 4 provides Monte Carlo

evidence and Section 5 the empirical findings. Section 6 concludes. The Appendix contains the proofs.

2. Statistical model and assumptions

We work with a very general class of continuous-time processes, namely Itô semimartingales. Its implicit no arbitrage properties make it the most popular model for log-price processes in financial econometrics. The model is formulated for the pair of a log price, X_t , and its corresponding volatility, σ_t , over a fixed time period $t \in [0, 1]$ on some filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbb{P})$:

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &= X_0 + \int_0^t b_s ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s dW_s + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \delta(s, z) \mathbb{1}_{\{|\delta(s, z)| \leq 1\}} (\mu - \nu)(ds, dz) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \delta(s, z) \mathbb{1}_{\{|\delta(s, z)| > 1\}} \mu(ds, dz). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_t &= \sigma_0 + \int_0^t \tilde{b}_s ds + \int_0^t \tilde{\sigma}_s d\tilde{W}_s + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{\delta}(s, z) \mathbb{1}_{\{|\tilde{\delta}(s, z)| \leq 1\}} (\mu - \nu)(ds, dz) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{\delta}(s, z) \mathbb{1}_{\{|\tilde{\delta}(s, z)| > 1\}} \mu(ds, dz), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

with two standard Brownian motions (W_s) and $(\tilde{W}_s)$. The Poisson random measure μ is compensated by $\nu(ds, dz) = \lambda(dz) \otimes ds$ with a σ -finite measure λ . We use the same μ in (1) and (2), such that μ is a jump measure on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$ governing the jumps in the log price and its volatility. The predictable functions, δ and $\tilde{\delta}$, defined on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$, determine common jumps of σ_t and X_t . Whenever $\delta\tilde{\delta} \equiv 0$, there is no price-volatility cojump. We write $\Delta X_t = X_t - X_{t-}$ with $X_{t-} = \lim_{s \uparrow t} X_s$ for the process of jumps in (X_t) and $\Delta \sigma_t^2$ for jumps of the squared volatility. We impose mild regularity assumptions on the characteristics of individual components.

Assumption 1. *The drift $(b_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a locally bounded process. The volatility never vanishes, $\inf_{t \in [0, 1]} \sigma_t > 0$ almost surely. For all $0 \leq t + s \leq 1$, $t \geq 0$, some constants $C_n, K_n > 0$, some $\alpha > 1/2$ and for a sequence of stopping times T_n increasing to ∞ , we have that*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\sigma_{(t+s) \wedge T_n} - \sigma_{t \wedge T_n} | \mathcal{F}_t] \right| \leq C_n s^\alpha, \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, s]} |\sigma_{(t+s) \wedge T_n} - \sigma_{t \wedge T_n}|^2 \right] \leq K_n s. \quad (4)$$

All characteristics in (2) are locally bounded.

This structural assumption is satisfied in the very general model (2), where the volatility process σ_t is an Itô semimartingale with locally bounded characteristics. Our asymptotic theory allows for more general processes than (2) as long as Assumption 1 is satisfied. For instance, long-memory fractional volatility components can be included. Thus, our theoretical setup includes almost any popular stochastic volatility model that allows for both continuous and discontinuous leverage effects. Assumption 1 does not exclude volatility jumps, only fixed times of discontinuity. Our notation follows that of Jacod and Protter (2012). We impose the following regularity condition on the jumps.

Assumption 2. Assume for the predictable function δ in (1) that $\sup_{\omega, x} |\delta(t, x)|/\gamma(x)$ is locally bounded with a non-negative deterministic function γ that satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (\gamma^r(x) \wedge 1) \lambda(dx) < \infty. \quad (5)$$

Further assume an analogous condition for $\tilde{\delta}$ in (2) with $r = 2$.

The index r , $0 \leq r \leq 2$ in (5) measures the jump activity. Smaller values of r make Assumption 2 more restrictive. In particular, $r = 0$ results in finite-activity jumps and $r = 1$ implies that jumps are summable.

Market microstructure noise makes it difficult to analyze price and volatility jumps. To efficiently exploit available high-frequency prices, we posit a latent discrete observation model with noise:

$$\text{Observe } Y_{t_i^n}, i = 0, \dots, n, \text{ with } Y_t = X_t + \epsilon_t, \quad (6)$$

where ϵ_t captures the market microstructure frictions. We use the typical notation $\Delta_i^n Y = Y_{t_i^n} - Y_{t_{i-1}^n}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, for noisy returns and analogously for the processes (X_t) and (ϵ_t) . In our baseline setup, market microstructure is captured by a white noise process $(\epsilon_t)_{t \geq 0}$, independent of X_t , with $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_t] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_t^2] = \eta^2$, as well as $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_t^{4+\delta}] < \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$, for all $t \in [0, 1]$. The process Y_t is accommodated on the product space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \mathcal{G}, (\mathcal{G}_t), \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$, where $\mathcal{G}_t = \mathcal{F}_t \otimes \sigma(\epsilon_s, s \leq t)$ contains information about the signal and noise. Below we extend the model to more general setups with serially correlated heteroscedastic noise. Because our methods to locally infer price and volatility jumps work for individual stock prices, non-synchronicity of the multivariate data is of less importance here.

3. Inference on the discontinuous leverage

The discontinuous leverage effect is defined as the relation between contemporaneous price and volatility jumps. We first address estimation and testing for price jumps with noisy data (6) in Section 3.1. For the stock price, the local testing problem at time point $\tau \in (0, 1)$ is as follows:

$$H_0 : \Delta X_\tau = 0 \text{ vs. } H_1 : |\Delta X_\tau| > 0.$$

Then, we turn to the estimation and testing for volatility jumps with noisy data in Section 3.2. For the volatility process, the testing problem is

$$H_0^* : \Delta \sigma_\tau^2 = 0 \text{ vs. } H_1^* : |\Delta \sigma_\tau^2| > 0.$$

In Section 3.3, we measure covariation between the estimated price and volatility-jump sizes to characterize the discontinuous leverage effect.

3.1. Local identification of price jumps

3.1.1. Local jump test and estimator using pre-averaged log prices

Lee and Mykland (2012) test for price jumps at some time $\tau \in (t_{l-M_n}^n, t_l^n)$ based on

$$T^{LM}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) = \hat{P}(t_l^n) - \hat{P}(t_{l-M_n}^n), \quad (7)$$

with the pre-processed price estimates

$$\hat{P}(t_j^n) = M_n^{-1} \sum_{i=j}^{(j+M_n-1) \vee n} Y_{t_i^n}. \quad (8)$$

The window length for the pre-averaging is $M_n = c\sqrt{n}$ with a proportionality constant c . The following proposition is a generalization of Lemma 1 in Lee and Mykland (2012), where the authors assume to observe discrete noisy observations from a jump-diffusion model.

Proposition 3.1. *Under the hypothesis H_0 , when there is no price jump at time τ , under Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 with $r < 4/3$ for equidistant observations, $t_i^n = i/n$, the Lee-Mykland test statistic (7) with $l = \lfloor \tau n \rfloor$ obeys the stable² central limit theorem,*

$$\sqrt{M_n} T^{LM}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) \xrightarrow{(st)} MN\left(0, \frac{1}{3}(\sigma_\tau^2 + \sigma_{\tau-}^2) c^2 + 2\eta^2\right), \quad (9)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ where MN stands for mixed normal. Under the alternative, when $\Delta X_\tau > 0$, the statistic (7) consistently estimates the jump size:

$$T^{LM}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) \xrightarrow{\bar{\mathbb{P}}} \Delta X_\tau, \quad (10)$$

and $|T^{LM}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) - \Delta X_\tau| = \mathcal{O}_{\bar{\mathbb{P}}}(n^{-1/4})$.

If there are no jumps in both price and volatility, $\sigma_\tau^2 = \sigma_{\tau-}^2$ in (9) holds. However, occasionally volatility may jump without a contemporaneous price jump. In the model given by equations (1) and (2), this occurs if μ gives a jump at time τ , which is eliminated by δ in the price process. The test accounts for such events in which only volatility jumps.

3.1.2. Local jump test and estimator using spectral statistics

To estimate price jumps using spectral statistics, we consider an orthogonal system of sine functions localized on a window around τ :

$$\Phi_{j,\tau}(t) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{h_n}} \sin(j\pi h_n^{-1}(t - (\tau - h_n/2))) \mathbb{1}_{[\tau - h_n/2, \tau + h_n/2]}(t), \quad j \geq 1. \quad (11)$$

Asymptotically efficient volatility estimation from noisy observations defined in (6) motivates consideration of local averages of noisy log prices in the frequency domain; see Reiß (2011) and Bibinger et al. (2014). Intuitively, *spectral statistics*,

$$S_j(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i^n Y \Phi_{j,\tau}((t_{i-1}^n + t_i^n)/2), \quad j \geq 1, \quad (12)$$

²Stable means stable convergence in law with respect to $\mathcal{F}$.

maximize the local information load about the signal process and thereby allow for local estimates of $X_\tau, X_{\tau-}$. The scaling factor in front of the sine in (11) ensures that $\int_{\tau-h_n/2}^{\tau+h_n/2} \Phi_{j,\tau}^2(t) dt = 1$. We propose the following statistic:

$$\mathcal{T}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) = \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} (-1)^{j+1} a_{2j-1} S_{2j-1}(\tau) \sqrt{h_n/2}, \quad (13)$$

with weights $(a_{2j-1})_{j \geq 1}$, to infer price jumps. (13) is thus a rescaled weighted sum of spectral statistics over odd spectral frequencies up to some spectral cutoff frequency $2J_n - 1$. Excluding even frequencies and alternating the sign of addends facilitates a consistent estimation of price jumps ΔX_τ , as in (10) above.

The window length is set to be $h_n = \kappa \log(n)/\sqrt{n}$ with some constant κ . Despite the logarithmic factor, the window length resembles the one in (8). We derive optimal oracle weights by minimizing the variance, which depends on time through the volatility σ_t . Yet, under Assumption 1, the error of approximating (σ_t^2) constant on $[\tau - h_n/2, \tau]$ and $[\tau, \tau + h_n/2]$ is asymptotically negligible. Then, as in the weighted least squares approach, this leads to optimal weights

$$a_j \propto 1/\text{Var}(S_j(\tau)).$$

In order to consistently estimate the jump $(X_\tau - X_{\tau-})$, we set $\sum_{j=1}^{J_n} a_{2j-1} = 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} a_{2j-1} &= \frac{(\text{Var}(S_{2j-1}(\tau)))^{-1}}{\left(\sum_{u=1}^{J_n} (\text{Var}(S_{2u-1}(\tau)))^{-1}\right)} \\ &= \frac{(\frac{1}{2}(\sigma_\tau^2 + \sigma_{\tau-}^2) + \pi^2(2j-1)^2 h_n^{-2} n^{-1} \eta^2)^{-1}}{\left(\sum_{u=1}^{J_n} (\frac{1}{2}(\sigma_\tau^2 + \sigma_{\tau-}^2) + \pi^2(2u-1)^2 h_n^{-2} n^{-1} \eta^2)^{-1}\right)}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

For an adaptive method, we estimate these oracle optimal weights by plugging in the estimated noise variance,

$$\hat{\eta}^2 = -n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Delta_i^n Y \Delta_{i-1}^n Y = \eta^2 + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}), \quad (15a)$$

and the pre-estimated spot squared volatility,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_{\tau-,pil}^2 &= r_n(J_p)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{r_n^{-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{J_p} (S_j^2(\tau - kh_n) - \pi^2 j^2 h_n^{-2} n^{-1} \hat{\eta}^2) \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{1}\left(\left|(J_p)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{J_p} (S_j^2(\tau - kh_n) - \pi^2 j^2 h_n^{-2} n^{-1} \hat{\eta}^2)\right| \leq u_n\right) \\ &= \sigma_{\tau-}^2 + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/8}), \end{aligned} \quad (15b)$$

with $r_n^{-1} = \mathcal{R}n^{1/4}$ for a constant $\mathcal{R}$, a threshold sequence $u_n = h_n^\tau$, $0 < \tau < 1$, and maximal spectral frequency J_p leading to the above rate-optimal estimators under Assumptions 1 and 2 with $r < 3/2$. The notation $S_j^2(\tau - kh_n)$ above refers to squared spectral statistics computed from r_n^{-1} bins with sine functions centered around times $\tau - kh_n$ before τ . $\hat{\sigma}_{\tau-,pil}^2$ is

the analog of (15b), replacing $\tau - kh_n$ by $\tau + kh_n$. Bibinger and Winkelmann (2016) detail the construction and prove the asymptotic properties of pre-estimators (15a) and (15b) and also suggest how to choose $\mathcal{R}$ and J_p .

Next, we state asymptotic results for $\mathcal{T}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y)$, which refers to statistic (13) with estimated optimal weights.

Proposition 3.2. *Under the hypothesis H_0 , when there is no price jump at time τ , under Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 with $r < 4/3$ for equidistant observations, $t_i^n = i/n$, our test statistic (13) obeys the stable central limit theorem as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $J_n \rightarrow \infty$:*

$$n^{1/4} \mathcal{T}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) \xrightarrow{(st)} MN\left(0, 2\left(\frac{\sigma_\tau^2 + \sigma_{\tau-}^2}{2}\right)^{1/2} \eta\right). \quad (16)$$

Under the alternative, when $\Delta X_\tau > 0$, the statistic (13) consistently estimates the jump:

$$\mathcal{T}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \Delta X_\tau, \quad (17)$$

and $|\mathcal{T}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) - \Delta X_\tau| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/4})$.

In the case of no volatility jump at τ , $\sigma_\tau = \sigma_{\tau-}$ and the asymptotic variance is $2\sigma_\tau \eta$. Finally, we extend Proposition 3.2 to a more realistic model that incorporates serially correlated heteroscedastic noise and non-regular sampling.

Assumption 3. *Assume the existence of a differentiable cumulative distribution function F that determines the observation times via a quantile transformation, $t_i^n = F^{-1}(i/n)$, $i = 0, \dots, n$. Assume $(F^{-1})'$ is α -Hölder continuous for some $\alpha > 1/2$, i.e., $|(F^{-1})'(t) - (F^{-1})'(s)| \leq |t - s|^\alpha$ for all s, t .*

The noise process (ϵ_t) is independent of X , for all t we have $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_t] = 0$, and it satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_t^{4+\delta}] < \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$. Further, assume $(\epsilon_{t_i^n})$ is an R -dependent process, such that $\text{Cov}(\epsilon_{t_i^n}, \epsilon_{t_{i+u}^n}) = 0$ for $u > R$ and some $R < \infty$, then the long-run variance process converges as follows:

$$\sum_{l=-\lfloor tn \rfloor}^{n-\lfloor tn \rfloor} \text{Cov}(\epsilon_{\lfloor tn \rfloor}, \epsilon_{\lfloor tn \rfloor + l}) \rightarrow \eta_t^2, \quad (18)$$

for $t \in [0, 1]$ uniformly in probability. The process $(\eta_t^2)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ is locally bounded and satisfies for all $t, (t + s) \in [0, 1]$ the mild smoothness condition:

$$|\eta_{t+s}^2 - \eta_t^2| \leq K s^\alpha. \quad (19)$$

The noise does not vanish: $\eta_t^2 > 0$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

Proposition 3.3. *Under the hypothesis H_0 and Assumptions 1, 2 with $r < 4/3$ and 3, the test statistic (13) obeys the stable central limit theorem as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $J_n \rightarrow \infty$*

$$n^{1/4} \mathcal{T}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) \xrightarrow{(st)} MN\left(0, 2\left(\frac{\sigma_\tau^2 + \sigma_{\tau-}^2}{2}\right)^{1/2} \eta_\tau ((F^{-1})'(\tau))^{1/2}\right). \quad (20)$$

One can construct standardized, feasible versions of (16) and (20) by inserting spot squared volatility and long-run noise variance estimators; see Bibinger and Winkelmann (2016) for such estimators. In fact, the pre-estimation of optimal weights also provides estimates of the variances of (13). The asymptotic variance of the Lee-Mykland test in (9) generalizes to $(1/3)(\sigma_\tau^2 + \sigma_{\tau-}^2)(F^{-1})'(\tau)c^2 + 2\eta_\tau^2$ under the conditions from Proposition 3.3.




Figure 1: Example for $\sum_{j=1}^J J^{-1}(-1)^{j+1}\Phi_{2j-1,\tau}(t)\sqrt{h_n/2}$ (top) and, with oracle optimal weights a_{2j-1} from the simulation setup in Section 4, $\sum_{j=1}^J a_{2j-1}(-1)^{j+1}\Phi_{2j-1,\tau}(t)\sqrt{h_n/2}$ (bottom) as functions of time t for three values of J on window $[\tau - h_n/2, \tau + h_n/2]$, $\tau = 0.5, h_n = 0.2$. The plots demonstrate that if a jump occurs on the interval, and not sufficiently close to τ , the estimation of ΔX_τ becomes biased for the actual jump.

Lee and Mykland (2012) provide a generalization to R -dependent noise using sub-sampling, and this directly applies to our general setup with Assumption 3.

The two statistics, (13) and (7), have the same convergence rates and similar asymptotic properties. Because the noise variance process (η_t^2) is usually very small (Hansen and Lunde (2006)), the asymptotic variance in (16) is usually much smaller than in (9). Thus, we expect the new spectral approach to attain a significantly smaller variance. We caution, however, that estimates via spectral statistics (13) and pre-averages (7) are biased when a jump is not located close to time τ but instead close to the edges of the local window. Figure 1 illustrates this. The bias for the Lee-Mykland estimator is linear. This effect directly relates to the so-called “pulverisation” of jumps by pre-averages described in Mykland and Zhang (2016). For our statistic it hinges on the weights and the spectral cutoff. The lower panel of Figure 1 reveals that the effect is similar for both methods.

3.2. Estimating volatility jumps

Given a price jump at time $\tau \in (0, 1)$, we estimate the contemporaneous volatility adjustment. We employ the spectral spot squared volatility estimators of Bibinger and Winkelmann (2016), smoothed over local windows before τ and after τ , to consistently estimate the volatilities σ_τ^2 and $\sigma_{\tau-}^2$. Concepts related to the Bibinger and Winkelmann (2016) test for contemporaneous price and volatility jumps allow the derivation of individual volatility-jump

sizes. Consider the statistic

$$T^*(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) = \hat{\sigma}_\tau^2 - \hat{\sigma}_{\tau-}^2. \quad (21)$$

The theory by Bibinger and Winkelmann (2016) renders the following result:

Corollary 3.4. *Under the hypothesis H_0^* , when there is no volatility jump at time τ , under Assumptions 1 and 2 with $r < 3/2$ for equidistant observations, $t_i^n = i/n$, and under Assumption 3 for the noise, the test statistics (21) satisfies*

$$n^{\beta/2} T^*(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) \xrightarrow{(st)} MN(0, 16\sigma_s^3 \eta_s) \quad (22)$$

with

$$0 < \beta < \left(1/4 \wedge \tau \left(1 - \frac{r}{2}\right)\right), \quad (23)$$

such that we come arbitrarily close to the rate $n^{1/8}$ in (22). In particular, we obtain a consistent estimate of the volatility jump: $T^*(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) - \Delta\sigma_\tau^2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-\beta/2})$.

The corollary provides an asymptotic test of the hypothesis of no volatility jump, $\Delta\sigma_\tau^2 = 0$, against the alternative that $\Delta\sigma_\tau^2 \neq 0$. An efficient test is given by the statistic (27) in Bibinger and Winkelmann (2016). For non-equidistant observations, the noise level in (22) includes $((F^{-1})'(\tau))^{1/2}$, analogous to (20) for price jumps.

3.3. Discontinuous leverage effect

The current section introduces a covariation measure for contemporaneous price and volatility jumps that combines the above spectral jump and volatility estimators. Aït-Sahalia et al. (2017) introduce the following as the *tail discontinuous leverage effect* in their equation (2.7):

$$[X, \sigma^2]_T^d(a) = \sum_{s \leq T} \Delta X_s (\sigma_s^2 - \sigma_{s-}^2) \mathbb{1}_{\{|\Delta X_s| > a\}}. \quad (24)$$

Based on our local methods and setting $T = 1$, we consider the estimator

$$\sum_{k=1}^{h_n^{-1}} \widehat{\Delta X}_{\tau_k} (\hat{\sigma}_{\tau_k}^2 - \hat{\sigma}_{\tau_k-}^2) \mathbb{1}_{\{\widehat{\Delta X}_{\tau_k} > a^2 \vee u_n\}}, \quad (25)$$

where $\widehat{\Delta X}_{\tau_k}$ is the estimated log-price jump and $\hat{\sigma}_{\tau_k}^2$ is the spot volatility estimate based on the methods above. With a fixed $a > 0$, or with $a = 0$ in case of finite activity jumps, we locate price jump times τ_k with a thresholding procedure, as introduced by Bibinger and Winkelmann (2015). A moving threshold, $u_n(k) = 2 \log(h_n^{-1}) h_n \hat{\sigma}_{\tau_k-, pil}^2$, with pre-estimated squared volatility, as in (15b), provides a bin-wise, locally adaptive truncation that accounts for intraday volatility patterns. Thereby, we can identify asymptotically small bins with jumps. However, following Bibinger and Winkelmann (2015), these bin-widths decay with order $n^{-1/2}$ and are of the same sizes as the bins on which the price-jump estimation is conducted. Thus, the bias discussed in Section 3.1 needs to be taken into account. While the estimation of volatility jumps is directly applicable, we adjust the price-jump estimation to obtain an overall consistent estimator of (24).

Because we cannot detect the exact jump time τ from observed log prices in the noisy model by thresholding, we cannot center the window $[\tau - h_n/2, \tau + h_n/2]$ around τ . Instead, we propose to use two separated windows, one to the left and one to the right of the price jump. The jump window $(t_{l-l_n}^n, t_{l+r_n}^n)$ with length $n^{-1/2}$ or smaller and $l = \lfloor \tau n \rfloor$ includes the price jump and can be detected by thresholding. The adjusted method uses (13) with the basis (11) centered around $Y_{t_{l+r_n}^n} - Y_{t_{l-l_n}^n}$ and with returns $\Delta_i^n Y$ on a window $[t_{l-l_n}^n - h_n/2, t_{l-l_n}^n]$ to the left of the jump window and $[t_{l+r_n}^n, t_{l+r_n}^n + h_n/2]$ to the right of the jump window. Thus, we delete observations $Y_{t_i^n}$ on $(t_{l-l_n}^n, t_{l+r_n}^n)$ and shift observations $Y_{t_i^n}$ from the left and right towards the center. We prove the adjusted method to be consistent with the same convergence rate of $n^{1/4}$. However, the constant in the variance can increase when the jump window is exactly of order $n^{-1/2}$.

Analogously, the Lee and Mykland statistic (7) can be adjusted for the unknown time point τ in the jump window $(t_{l-l_n}^n, t_{l+r_n}^n)$. We estimate the price to the left of the jump window with $\hat{P}(t_{l+r_n}^n)$ and to the right of the jump window with $\hat{P}(t_{l-l_n-M_n}^n)$. This adjustment is robust in the sense of providing an unbiased estimator with the same convergence rate.

Removing jump windows has a locally similar effect as downsampling the data to a lower observation frequency. Given the discussion about spurious jump detection via downsampling by Christensen et al. (2014), one would like to avoid deleting jump windows in the empirical application. Therefore, an alternative adjustment appears attractive. On asymptotically small bins $[(k-1)h_n, kh_n)$, we set

$$\tau_k = \operatorname{argmax}_i \{t_i^n \in [(k-1)h_n, kh_n) \mid |\Delta_i^n Y|\}.$$

Given a detected price jump in one bin, we choose τ_k as the i that maximizes $|\Delta_i^n Y|$ within the bin instead of cutting out some smaller window. Since the noise is centered and its variance $\eta_{\tau_k}^2$ typically is rather small (see Hansen and Lunde (2006)), the time of the largest return usually will be a good candidate for the jump arrival. In particular, if we address jumps much larger than η_{τ_k} , this method performs well in practice. This does not mean that the return itself consistently estimates the jump, however. Theoretically, centering the jump window around the largest return is only suitable assuming $\eta \rightarrow 0$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$. This method is superior to the cut-out principle in that it requires one fewer tuning parameter, has less risk of estimating spuriously large jumps (as discussed by Christensen et al. (2014)) and has smaller variance.

Following Jacod et al. (2017), we consider the ratio

$$\frac{[X, \sigma^2]_T^d(a)}{\sqrt{[X, X]_T^d(a)[\sigma^2, \sigma^2]_T^d(a)}} = \frac{\sum_{s \leq T} \Delta X_s \Delta \sigma_s^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|\Delta X_s| > a\}}}{\sqrt{\sum_{s \leq T} (\Delta X_s)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|\Delta X_s| > a\}}} \sqrt{\sum_{s \leq T} (\Delta \sigma_s^2)^2}} \quad (26)$$

as a scaled measure of the discontinuous leverage, that is, the correlation between contemporaneous price and volatility jumps. We may use $a = 0$ in case of finite activity jumps, $r = 0$ in Assumption 2. We point out that (26) is a path-wise defined, integrated measure. (26) is a scalar parameter only under the restriction to time-homogeneous jump measures.

Aït-Sahalia et al. (2017) present a central limit theorem for the continuous leverage effect

in the presence of microstructure noise. They point out that a central limit theorem for the discontinuous part in the presence of noise cannot generally be obtained with pre-averaging or related approaches. However, by focusing either on the tail discontinuous leverage effect with some $a > 0$ or assuming $r = 0$ in Assumption 2, we derive the following asymptotic result:

Proposition 3.5. *The estimator for the tail discontinuous leverage effect*

$$[\widehat{X, \sigma^2}]_1^d(a) = \sum_{k=1}^{h_n^{-1}} \widehat{\Delta X}_{\tau_k} (\hat{\sigma}_{\tau_k}^2 - \hat{\sigma}_{\tau_k-}^2) \mathbb{1}_{\{\Delta_k[\widehat{X, X}] > a^2 \vee u_n\}} \quad (27)$$

satisfies under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, for any $a > 0$, the feasible (self-scaling) central limit theorem

$$n^{\beta/2} \frac{([\widehat{X, \sigma^2}]_1^d(a) - [X, \sigma^2]_1^d(a))}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^{h_n^{-1}} (\widehat{\Delta X}_{\tau_k})^2 8\hat{\eta}_{\tau_k} (\hat{\sigma}_{\tau_k}^3 + \hat{\sigma}_{\tau_k-}^3) \mathbb{1}_{\{\Delta_k[\widehat{X, X}] > a^2 \vee u_n\}} \right)^{1/2}} \xrightarrow{(d)} N(0, 1), \quad (28)$$

with β as in (23). If no price jump is detected, we set the estimate equal to zero. In particular, the limit theorem facilitates, for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, an asymptotic level α test with asymptotic power 1 for testing the hypothesis $\tilde{H}_0 : [X, \sigma^2]_1^d(a) = 0$ against the alternative $\tilde{H}_1 : [X, \sigma^2]_1^d(a) \neq 0$:

$$\varphi = \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ |n^{\beta/2} [\widehat{X, \sigma^2}]_1^d(a)| > q_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{h_n^{-1}} (\widehat{\Delta X}_{\tau_k})^2 8\hat{\eta}_{\tau_k} (\hat{\sigma}_{\tau_k}^3 + \hat{\sigma}_{\tau_k-}^3) \mathbb{1}_{\{\Delta_k[\widehat{X, X}] > a^2 \vee u_n\}}} \right\}}, \quad (29)$$

where the $(1 - \alpha/2)$ quantile of the standard normal law is denoted by $q_{1-\alpha/2}$.

One loses no generality by imposing the scaling $T = 1$. Any fixed $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ can be considered.

Corollary 3.6. *In case of finite jump activity, $r = 0$ in Assumption 2, the estimator for the discontinuous leverage effect,*

$$[\widehat{X, \sigma^2}]_1^d = \sum_{k=1}^{h_n^{-1}} \widehat{\Delta X}_{\tau_k} (\hat{\sigma}_{\tau_k}^2 - \hat{\sigma}_{\tau_k-}^2) \mathbb{1}_{\{\Delta_k[\widehat{X, X}] > u_n\}}, \quad (30)$$

satisfies under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 the feasible central limit theorem,

$$n^{\beta/2} \frac{([\widehat{X, \sigma^2}]_1^d - [X, \sigma^2]_1^d)}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^{h_n^{-1}} (\widehat{\Delta X}_{\tau_k})^2 8\hat{\eta}_{\tau_k} (\hat{\sigma}_{\tau_k}^3 + \hat{\sigma}_{\tau_k-}^3) \mathbb{1}_{\{\Delta_k[\widehat{X, X}] > u_n\}} \right)^{1/2}} \xrightarrow{(d)} N(0, 1). \quad (31)$$

Proposition 3.5 follows from combining our results for estimating price jumps with results from Bibinger and Winkelmann (2016). However, the proof cannot be extended in a similar way to the case $r \neq 0$ and $a = 0$ when considering infinitely many small price jumps. It is unknown if an asymptotic distribution theory is possible in this general case. Proposition 3.5 and Corollary 3.6 give us exactly the statistics we require to apply in our data study.

4. Simulations

This section reports the results of simulation studies of the finite-sample properties of the price-jump tests, the corresponding price-jump estimators and the discontinuous leverage statistics. The simulation study in Bibinger and Winkelmann (2016) evaluates the finite-sample inference on volatility jumps.

This simulation study emulates that of Lee and Mykland (2012). Although their theory only applies to the jump-diffusion setup, they simulate a more complex and realistic model, including stochastic volatility and time-varying noise. The efficient price follows

$$X_t = 1 + \int_0^t \sigma_s dW_s, t \in [0, 1], \quad (32)$$

with Heston-type stochastic volatility

$$d\sigma_s^2 = 0.0162 (0.8465 - \sigma_s^2) ds + 0.117 \sigma_s dB_s, \quad (33)$$

where B and W are two independent standard Brownian motions. We adopt the parameter values of Lee and Mykland (2012) in (33) and assume 252 trading days per year and 7.5 trading hours a day. The model for the market microstructure noise is

$$\epsilon_{t_i^n} = 0.0861 \Delta_i^n X + 0.06 (\Delta_i^n X + \Delta_{i-1}^n X) U_i, i = 0, \dots, n, \quad (34)$$

with $(U_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n}$ being a sequence of normally distributed random variables with expectation 0 and variance q^2 . We consider two parameterizations of q , which governs the noise level (market quality parameter). The cross correlation between X and noise violates one of our theoretical assumptions, but we expect no degradation in the performance of our approach. We estimate q in the presence of serial correlation with the noise estimator suggested in Proposition 1 of Lee and Mykland (2012).

We implement the self-scaling adaptive version of (13) with pre-estimated optimal weights. The caption of Table 1 gives values of h_n . The pre-averaging for the Lee-Mykland statistics (7) refers to a block-size $M_n = c \sqrt{n/k}$, where k denotes the order of serial correlation in the noise. The constant c is chosen according to Table 5 of Lee and Mykland (2012).

Evaluation of the pre-average and spectral tests to infer price jumps

Lee and Mykland (2012) compare the performance of the noise-robust local jump tests in Lee and Mykland (2012) to those in Lee and Mykland (2008), which is not designed to be robust to noise. We replicate this simulation study and compare outcomes of the two tests discussed in Section 3. The setting is well-suited to compare the test properties in a realistic framework and also allows us to compare our results to those in Table 4 of Lee and Mykland (2012). Realizations of $Y_i = X_{t_i^n} + \epsilon_{t_i^n}$ are generated over one trading hour under time resolutions of 1, 2 and 3 seconds, respectively ($n = 3600; 1800; 1200$). The jump size in τ is related to the noise level q , i.e., $\Delta X_\tau = 0$ under the hypothesis and $\Delta X_\tau = q; 2q; 3q$ under the alternative.

Table 1 shows the simulation results, along with the values reported by Lee and Mykland (2012) in parentheses. Most of our results for the Lee-Mykland test closely track the ones

Table 1: Comparison of size and power of the two tests.

Moderate noise case, $q = 0.0005$								
Frequency (n)	$\Delta X_\tau = 0$		$\Delta X_\tau = q$		$\Delta X_\tau = 2q$		$\Delta X_\tau = 3q$	
Test	LM	BNW	LM	BNW	LM	BNW	LM	BNW
3 sec (1200)	0.049 (0.034)*	0.045	0.199 (0.059)*	0.274	0.473 (0.320)*	0.677	0.777 (0.786)*	0.924
2 sec (1800)	0.050 (0.030)*	0.053	0.280 (0.071)*	0.382	0.695 (0.483)*	0.828	0.937 (0.920)*	0.988
1 sec (3600)	0.049 (0.046)*	0.056	0.281 (0.091)*	0.594	0.697 (0.709)*	0.982	0.950 (0.988)*	1
Large noise case, $q = 0.005$								
Frequency (n)	$\Delta X_\tau = 0$		$\Delta X_\tau = q$		$\Delta X_\tau = 2q$		$\Delta X_\tau = 3q$	
Test	LM	BNW	LM	BNW	LM	BNW	LM	BNW
3 sec (1200)	0.052 (0.046)*	0.049	0.296 (0.275)*	0.996	0.803 (0.889)*	1	0.997 (0.997)*	1
2 sec (1800)	0.053 (0.046)*	0.052	0.465 (0.593)*	0.999	0.937 (0.998)*	1	0.988 (1)*	1
1 sec (3600)	0.050 (0.041)*	0.049	0.829 (0.918)*	1	0.994 (1)*	1	0.997 (1)*	1

The table lists the simulated values of standardized test statistics (7) and (13), from 6000 iterations for each configuration, exceeding the 0.05-quantile of the standard normal. “LM” marks the Lee-Mykland and “BNW” our proposed spectral test. We simulated from the model given by (32), (33) and (34). In parentheses ()*, we report the values from Table 4 in Lee and Mykland (2012) of their analogous simulation study. According to Table 5 in Lee and Mykland (2012), we used constants $c = 1/19$ for $q = 0.0005$ and $c = 1/9$ for $q = 0.005$ to determine M_n in (7) (for $\Delta X_\tau = 2q, 3q$ and $q = 0.005$, we doubled M_n , which increased the power). For (13), we used $h_n = \kappa \log(n)/\sqrt{n}$ with $\kappa \approx 5/12$ for $q = .0005$ and $\kappa \approx 2/3$ for $q = .005$.

reported by Lee and Mykland (2012). Our results for the power under moderate noise and smaller jumps are a bit better than expected from Lee and Mykland (2012), while some results in the large noise case are smaller. In the large noise case, we report values where M_n is doubled compared to the constant adopted from Lee and Mykland (2012), which led to higher power. The windows used for the spectral method are much larger than the values M_n/n for the test given in (7). At first glance it might seem surprising that the power in Table 1 increases for larger noise. This is not, however, because of large noise that makes precise testing and estimation more difficult, but because the jump sizes increase along with q . Large jumps naturally lead to better testing results. The size of both tests on the hypothesis appears to be accurate. The new spectral test (11) attains a considerably higher power in all cases. Intuitively, we expect that our method provides larger efficiency gains for smaller noise levels and higher observation frequencies.

Evaluation of the pre-average and spectral estimators for price-jump sizes

In the same setup, we compare the performance of the jump-size estimators. Table 2 confirms that in all configurations, with the same optimal parameter choice as above, our spectral estimator attains a smaller root mean square error (RMSE) than the Lee-Mykland estimator. Efficiency gains are most relevant for the configuration with moderate noise and the smallest jump size. This is expected because the variance in (16) becomes smaller than the one in (9) for a smaller η . In this setup, our new estimator has a RMSE that is almost 50% smaller for

Table 2: Comparison of RMSEs for the two price-jump size estimators.

Moderate noise case, $q = 0.0005$						
Frequency (n)	$\Delta X_\tau = q$		$\Delta X_\tau = 2q$		$\Delta X_\tau = 3q$	
Estimator	LM	BNW	LM	BNW	LM	BNW
3 sec (1200)	11.0	9.9	11.1	10.2	11.9	10.8
2 sec (1800)	6.8	5.3	6.9	6.0	7.9	6.8
1 sec (3600)	4.7	2.6	4.8	3.6	6.3	4.7
Large noise case, $q = 0.005$						
Frequency (n)	$\Delta X_\tau = q$		$\Delta X_\tau = 2q$		$\Delta X_\tau = 3q$	
Estimator	LM	BNW	LM	BNW	LM	BNW
3 sec (1200)	14.8	14.4	15.0	14.5	15.2	14.5
2 sec (1800)	10.0	9.4	10.2	9.5	10.6	9.5
1 sec (3600)	5.6	4.5	5.9	4.6	6.4	4.6

The table lists the root mean square errors, rescaled with 10^4 of the estimators (7) and (13), from 6000 iterations for each configuration under the alternative when price jumps are present. “LM” marks the Lee-Mykland and “BNW” our proposed estimator. We simulated from the model given by (32), (33) and (34). Tuning parameters are the same as reported in Table 1.

$n = 3600$. For large noise and jump size q , our new estimator reduces the RMSE by 20%. These significant improvements of estimation accuracy are particularly relevant because the moderate noise setting is realistic for current high-frequency data.

Figure 2 demonstrates the accuracy of the normal limit laws in (16) and (9) for the finite-sample simulations. For both tests, the asymptotic normality provides a good fit of the empirical distributions on both the hypothesis and alternative.

Evaluation of the discontinuous leverage estimator

We modify the above simulation setup by adding one jump at a random time to the volatility in (33). The volatility jump size is set to the median value from our empirical sample in Table 3. To create discontinuous leverage, we implement a contemporaneous downward price jump of 0.2%, which is comparable to the sizes in Figure 4. Using a rather large price jump and average volatility jump-size allows us to study the finite-sample accuracy of the result (28). Because such a jump is well detected by thresholding, the accuracy of the discontinuous leverage estimator (27) can be analyzed. We simulate one trading day with observation frequencies of 1, 2 and 3 seconds, frequencies that generate 23400, 11700 and 7800 observations, respectively, over the day. We estimate the discontinuous leverage (24) in a model with moderate microstructure noise. We first conduct the spectral estimation over a partition of the whole day, identifying price jumps by thresholding. Next, we estimate the squared volatility before and after the jump by local averages of the bin-wise parametric estimates over 4 bins. Then, we estimate the local jump size using (13). As explained above, we identify a bin with a price jump by thresholding and center the window for price-jump estimation on the largest absolute return in the bin containing the price jump. The window sizes for the first step and the price-jump estimation are equal: we use $h^{-1} = 100$ for 1-second frequencies and $h^{-1} = 50$ for the two smaller frequencies. The spectral cutoff




Figure 2: QQ-normal plots for the Lee-Mykland statistics (left) and our statistics (13) (right). The top panels depict the 6000 iterations on the hypothesis. The bottom panels show results for the iterations when $\Delta X_\tau = q = 0.0005$ under the alternative.

frequency is set to $J = 30$ in all cases. Estimates are reasonably robust to different values of h and J .

For the fixed true value -1.741×10^{-7} of (24), we obtain these estimates:

Frequency	1 sec	2 sec	3 sec
Bias ³	-0.04	-0.02	-0.04
Variance ³	0.21	0.23	0.25

The inherently slow convergence rate of the estimation leads to a pronounced finite sample variance also at the highest observation frequency. Fortunately, the accuracy decays very slowly for smaller sample sizes. Figure 3 shows QQ-normal plots for the central limit theorem (28). The normal distribution fits reasonably well for all frequencies. Our test for the discontinuous leverage effect attains a power of approximately 70% in the case of one observation per second and only slightly smaller power for the smaller observation frequencies. Overall, simulations indicate that the estimation performs well in this complex environment.

5. The discontinuous leverage in stock prices

In this section we present the empirical results produced by the spectral methods proposed in Section 3. We first introduce the dataset and discuss the estimation of jumps in prices and volatility on this dataset. Second, we investigate the discontinuous leverage effect,

³We rescale all values with 10^7 .




Figure 3: QQ-normal plots for (28), 1-second (left) and 3-second frequencies (right).

i.e., a covariation measure, and the correlations of price and volatility cojumps. Finally, we explain the heterogeneity in discontinuous leverage and correlation estimates across firms.

5.1. Price and volatility cojumps

We use NASDAQ order book data from the LOBSTER database. Initially, we pick the 30 stocks with the largest market capitalizations from each of the 12 NASDAQ industries for a total of $12 * 30 = 360$ stocks.⁴ The sample spans January 1, 2010, to December 31, 2015, 1,509 days with trading from 9:30 to 16:00 EST. The tick-by-tick data shows evidence of market microstructure noise in that returns have a significant negative first-order autocorrelation and the sum of squared returns increases exponentially for higher sampling frequencies. As shown in the simulations of Winkelmann et al. (2016), spectral estimators perform particularly well with liquid stocks, i.e., those having about one trade every 15 seconds. To confine ourselves to analyzing very liquid stocks, we exclude trading days for a given stock with fewer than 1,500 trades.⁵ This selection procedure reduces the number of firms to 320. We focus on transactions with returns different from zero. We do not adjust the data further; that is, we do not clean or synchronize trades. The number of observed trades varies substantially across stocks and days. There is a maximum of 227,139 intradaily observations for the Apple Inc. stock on September 9, 2014; the median number of daily transactions across stocks is much smaller, only 5,977.

The local jump detection and estimation takes the time-varying trading activity into account. We partition each trading day d into $h^{-1,(d,s)} = K^{(d,s)}$ bins for every stock s . As suggested by our theoretical results, the number of bins $k = 1, \dots, K^{(d,s)}$ grows with the number of trades $n^{(d,s)}$ with $K^{(d,s)} = \lfloor 3\sqrt{n^{(d,s)}} \log(n^{(d,s)})^{-1} \rfloor$. We detect price jumps by applying the adaptive threshold, $\hat{u}_k^{(d,s)} = 2 \log(K^{(d,s)}) / K^{(d,s)} \hat{\sigma}_{k,pil}^{2,(d,s)}$, to bin-wise estimates of increments in quadratic variation. It is well-known that the number of detected price jumps depends on the thresholding procedure in that a lower threshold usually increases the number of detected small price jumps.⁶ We find that relatively small volatility changes at price-jump

⁴The industries can be found on www.nasdaq.com/screening/industries.aspx. The year 2013 serves as the baseline year.

⁵Results are robust to a higher (2,000) and lower (1,000) threshold.

⁶The main results about the discontinuous leverage are robust against different threshold choices. As a




Figure 4: Price process at the NASDAQ stock exchange of Apple Inc. on two different days with price volatility jumps. Number of trades: 87,445 (left), 40,707 (right).

time points strongly influence the discontinuous leverage estimates. For that reason, we apply the test for volatility jumps, as proposed by Bibinger and Winkelmann (2016), to focus on price jumps with significant contemporaneous volatility jumps.⁷ The tests for volatility jumps reduce the influence the price-jump-detection threshold has on the discontinuous leverage estimates. The jump estimator (13) is centered around the largest absolute return on a detected bin. The number of frequencies studied on each bin is $J^{(d,s)} = 5 \log(n^{(d,s)})$. To estimate spot volatility to the right and to the left of the detected price jump, we average the truncated spectral statistics over $R^{(d,s)} = \lceil 3\sqrt[4]{n^{(d,s)}} / \log(n^{(d,s)}) \rceil$ bins.

Figure 4 shows two examples of price-volatility cojumps of the Apple Inc. stock. The strong shifts in the price process indicate an upward price jump (left panel) and a downward price jump (right panel). The estimates of the price jumps are 0.13% and -0.23%, respectively. Note that if one would approximate the price-jump sizes just by looking at Figure 4 and assuming a small noise level, one may expect much larger price-jump estimates. As discussed by Christensen et al. (2014), a seemingly large return can consist of smaller, unidirectional returns on a tight time interval. This explains how downsampling to lower observation frequencies can affect not only jump detection but can also distort the estimation of price-jump sizes. Figure 4 also suggests that volatility jumped contemporaneously with the price jump. That is, the variability of the stock price appears in both cases much smaller before the price jump than afterwards. This apparent jump in volatility is not an artifact of the price jump mechanically feeding through to higher volatility. Indeed statistic (21), which estimates the change in volatility, only uses log-price information from bins that neighbor the price-jump window. Thus, the increase in variability due to the impact effect of the price jump does not feed into the volatility-jump estimation. The increase in spot volatility evaluated approximately 30 minutes before and after the price jumps is 184% (left panel of Figure 4) and 163% (right panel of Figure 4). Note that a strong upward jump

robustness check, we substitute the $\log(n)$ term of the threshold to $\log(\log(n))$, which increases the number of price-jump days per stock from 11% to 27%.

⁷Note that in (25), summands without a volatility jump “automatically” cancel out because $\sigma_{\tau}^2 = \sigma_{\tau-}^2$. To control the overall significance level of tests across firms and price jumps at level $\alpha = 0.1$, we use the Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) step-up procedure (the false discovery rate).

Table 3: Price and volatility cojumps: NASDAQ order book, 2010-2015.

Conditioning criteria	# of cojumps	Price-jump size			Volatility-jump size		
		$Q_{0.25}$	$Q_{0.5}$	$Q_{0.75}$	$Q_{0.25}$	$Q_{0.5}$	$Q_{0.75}$
Panel A: Apple Inc. stock							
All jumps	167	-0.068	-0.020	0.035	-39.9	84.3	223.5
Positive price jumps							
· All	72	0.026	0.041	0.104	-39.2	78.3	173.3
· Market	22	0.031	0.103	0.226	133.7	252.3	382.4
· Idiosyncratic	29	0.017	0.033	0.076	-42.3	38.4	109.1
Negative price jumps							
· All	95	-0.125	-0.057	-0.029	-39.9	91.4	250.4
· Market	27	-0.157	-0.101	-0.046	136.3	236.8	530.5
· Idiosyncratic	40	-0.127	-0.070	-0.035	-40.8	69.1	132.6
Panel B: Mean across all stocks							
All jumps	66.5	-0.129	0.003	0.147	-51.7	102.9	329.8
Positive price jumps							
· All	32.7	0.106	0.158	0.268	-34.8	112.5	335.0
· Market	12.0	0.149	0.225	0.362	122.9	240.9	396.9
· Idiosyncratic	12.0	0.094	0.139	0.219	-51.2	32.9	221.1
Negative price jumps							
· All	33.8	-0.263	-0.164	-0.103	-44.3	106.6	323.7
· Market	12.1	-0.290	-0.183	-0.122	135.2	258.6	439.5
· Idiosyncratic	12.8	-0.236	-0.154	-0.103	-56.8	21.5	237.1

Notes: Quantiles (Q) of the jump distributions are in percent. Market jumps refer to 10% of all days where most of the firms cojump. Idiosyncratic jumps refer to days where not more than 11 stocks cojump.

in both the price and volatility process (left panel of Figure 4) is not consistent with a generally negative price-volatility cojump correlation in high-frequency data that Bandi and Renò (2016) report for S&P 500 futures.

To get deeper insights about price and volatility cojumps, Table 3 shows summary statistics for detected cojumps and quantiles of the respective jump distribution. We condition results on the sign of price jumps and whether they are market-wide or idiosyncratic. We define market-wide jumps as jumps that occur on days when most firms jump during the day. Market-wide jumps occur on 10% of the days in the sample. Idiosyncratic jumps are characterized by days where at most 11 firms cojump.⁸ Panel A of Table 3 shows summary statistics for the Apple Inc. stock, Panel B displays averages across the 320 stocks.

The top row of Panel A of Table 3 shows that the Apple Inc. stock price displays 167 contemporaneous price-volatility cojumps, with slightly more downward price jumps (57%) than upward price jumps. Panel B of Table 3 shows that the average number of price-volatility cojumps in the six-year sample across all individual stocks is 66.5. The quantiles of the price jump and volatility-jump distributions given in columns three to five and six to eight, respectively, indicate that idiosyncratic jumps are smaller than market-wide jumps. The magnitude of price jumps is in line with the sizes of -0.15 to 0.18% reported by Lee and Mykland (2012) for the IBM stock in 2007.

The magnitude of volatility jumps is striking. News announcements can have huge effects

⁸Market-wide and idiosyncratic jumps are polar cases but not an exhaustive jump classification. There are days that meet neither the market-wide nor the idiosyncratic criteria.




Figure 5: Scatter plot of price jumps and contemporaneous volatility jumps. Sample period 2010-2015.

on stock volatility. The 0.75 empirical quantile of the volatility-jump distribution of the Apple Inc. stock for negative market-wide price jumps is about 530%. That is, volatility frequently jumps to more than five times its pre-jump size when prices jump down. The analogous 0.75 quantile for volatility jumps, conditional on a market-wide negative price jump, averaged across all firms is 439%. Scheduled news announcements are known to reduce trading and volatility right before the announcement but portend a strong response afterwards, which is manifested in large volatility jumps. The rows labeled “market” in Panel B of Table 3 show that volatility jumps are usually positive for market-wide price jumps. There are more negative volatility jumps on days of idiosyncratic price jumps. That is, conditional on negative price jumps, the 0.25 volatility-jump quantile for market-wide jumps for all stocks is 135.2% but -56.8% for idiosyncratic jumps. Overall, the volatility-jump distribution is right-skewed, indicating the important role of upward jumps in volatility.

5.2. The discontinuous leverage effect

Figure 5 shows a scatter plot of the Apple Inc. price-volatility cojumps from 2010 to 2015 to illustrate a typical relation between price jumps and contemporaneous volatility jumps. Following Duffie et al. (2000) and Bandi and Renò (2016), one would expect an unconditional, negative linear relation between the price and volatility-jump sizes. However, the figure does not depict such a uniformly negative relation. Indeed, row 1 of Table 4 documents the elusive relation of price-volatility cojumps across firms. The test (28) rejects the null hypothesis of no discontinuous leverage effect for only 7.8% of the 320 firms. The correlation (26) is usually close to zero, with inconsistent signs across firms. The median correlation across all firms is 0.002.

The result confirms previous negative findings of parametric asset pricing models by Chernov et al. (2003), Eraker et al. (2003) and Eraker (2004), who use U.S. stock index and option data. Jacod et al. (2017) also find no significant correlation of price-volatility cojumps in one-minute S&P 500 ETF data. Row 1 of Table 4 thus extends the literature’s negative results to the cross-section of individual stock price processes.

Given that it is difficult to reject the hypothesis of no discontinuous leverage effect, the question arises if we should expect the discontinuous relation to be similar to that of

Table 4: The discontinuous leverage across NASDAQ firms.

Row	Conditioning criteria	Rejection rate	Correlation quantiles		
			$Q_{0.25}$	$Q_{0.50}$	$Q_{0.75}$
1	All jumps	0.078	-0.14	0.00	0.12
	Positive price jumps				
2	· All	0.495	0.09	0.26	0.44
3	· Market	0.842	0.10	0.32	0.53
4	· Idiosyncratic	0.223	-0.21	0.19	0.51
	Negative price jumps				
5	· All	0.553	-0.49	-0.30	-0.10
6	· Market	0.879	-0.64	-0.41	-0.20
7	· Idiosyncratic	0.214	-0.49	-0.18	0.17

Notes: The rejection rate indicates the percentage of firms having a significant discontinuous leverage effect. The empirical quantiles contain all correlation coefficients $Corr(\Delta X, \Delta \sigma^2)$ across firms.

the continuous leverage. As discovered by Lahaye et al. (2011), specific events cause large jumps and those jumps are relatively rare. Volatility jumps are very large on impact, but the level of volatility often subsequently decays quickly in the direction of a pre-event level. The impact of news potentially drives common price and volatility jumps, as described by Veronesi (2000) and Pástor and Veronesi (2012, 2013). We conjecture that such news effects usually trigger upward jumps in volatility, regardless of the effect on prices, and thus produce a positive (negative) correlation of volatility jumps with contemporaneous upward (downward) price jumps. To investigate this response pattern, we condition the discontinuous leverage estimates on the sign of the price jumps.

Rows 2 and 5 of Table 4 show the outcomes of the leverage test (28) conditional on upward and downward price jumps, respectively. We focus on stocks with more than 15 price-volatility cojumps and exclude jumps larger than six standard deviations, which leaves us with 295 firms. Row 2 of Table 4 shows that approximately 50% of the firms display a significant discontinuous leverage effect if prices jump up. Similarly, row 5 of Table 4 shows that 55% of the firms have a statistically significant discontinuous leverage effect for negative price jumps. Quantiles of the correlations (26) indicate that the discontinuous leverage effect is negative for downward price jumps and positive for upward price jumps. The positive (negative) relation between positive (negative) price jumps and contemporaneous volatility jumps is also visible in the scatter plot in Figure 5.

In addition to conditioning on the sign of the price jump, we consider the fact that in standard asset pricing models only systematic risk is priced. Ang et al. (2006) study the relation between idiosyncratic volatility and returns, for example. Market-wide jumps are usually related to macroeconomic news announcements and trigger cojumps across a large fraction of all firms. In contrast, idiosyncratic jumps pick up firm-specific events and smaller jumps due to technical trading issues and should have no systematic pattern across stocks.

When we condition on whether the price jumps are market-wide or idiosyncratic, we establish a strong relation between discontinuities in prices and volatility (see rows 3 and 6 of Table 4). We focus on firms having more than 15 market-price-volatility cojumps and omit jumps larger than six times its standard deviation. This shrinks the number of firms

to 215. Under these conditions, market-wide upward price jumps (see row 3 of Table 4) are positively correlated with contemporaneous volatility jumps for 84% of the firms. The median correlation between market-wide positive price jumps and volatility jumps is 0.32 (see row 3 of Table 4). For market-wide downward price jumps (see row 6 of Table 4), we find a significant downward sloping relation for 88% of the firms. The median correlation is -0.41. A comparison of rows 3 to 4 and 6 to 7 of Table 4 shows that market-wide price jumps are more strongly correlated with contemporaneous volatility jumps than are idiosyncratic price jumps. As shown in the previous subsection, market-wide events coincide with large price and volatility jumps. This allows us to conclude that the tail discontinuous leverage is particularly strong.

In contrast to market-wide jumps, idiosyncratic jumps are smaller, coming more from the center of the jump distributions, and display a much weaker discontinuous leverage effect. Rows 4 and 7 of Table 4 indicate that only about 20% of the stocks have a significant discontinuous leverage relation for idiosyncratic jumps. The associated correlations of price-volatility cojumps are more widely spread.

All in all, two forces prevent an unconditionally negative discontinuous leverage effect: First, the sign of the price-volatility cojump depends on the sign of the price jump. That is, positive (negative) price jumps are positively (negatively) correlated with contemporaneous volatility jumps. Second, the correlation is much stronger for market-wide price jumps than for idiosyncratic price jumps.

The positive (negative) correlation between upward (downward) price jumps and contemporaneous volatility jumps can explain why Jacod et al. (2017) find no significant, unconditional correlation between price and volatility jumps, while Todorov and Tauchen (2011) report a strong positive relation between squared price jumps and jumps in volatility. The weak relation between idiosyncratic price jumps and volatility jumps relates to Yu (2012), who model a time-varying leverage effect in a (semi)parametric stochastic volatility model where the time-variation is associated with the size of returns. By conditioning on positive and negative price jumps, we focus on Yu’s positive and negative extreme states. Our analysis indicates that it is important to distinguish market-wide and idiosyncratic jumps, which roughly implies distinguishing the tail from the rest of the price-jump distribution.

5.3. Drivers of the discontinuous leverage

Firms tend to have consistently signed discontinuous leverage relations. That is, most firms have positive correlations between upward price jumps and contemporaneous jumps in volatility and negative correlations between downward price jumps and jumps in volatility. By studying the correlation between squared price jumps and contemporaneous volatility jumps, Todorov and Tauchen (2011) implicitly assume that the relation of positive and negative price jumps with volatility jumps is symmetric. However, Figure 6 illustrates heterogeneity in discontinuous leverage estimates (24) and correlations (26). If all firms had the same discontinuous leverage and same correlations for positive price jumps as they do for negative price jumps, the points (tickers) in Figure 6 would all lay on the diagonal lines in the two panels. Clearly, they do not. The distance to the diagonal line in Figure 6 (left panel) highlights that, for a given firm, positive and negative price jumps are usually associated with different discontinuous leverage estimates. The dispersion around the diagonal




Figure 6: Scatter plot of the discontinuous leverage estimates (left) and price-volatility cojump correlations (right) for market-wide positive and negative price jumps. Tickers indicate the size of leverage and correlation. For illustration purposes, not all tickers are shown. The gray lines show the locus of points on which the discontinuous leverage effect and correlations are symmetric. The sample period is 2010-2015.

becomes larger in absolute terms for larger leverage estimates. The right panel of Figure 6 suggests that stocks with strong correlations between upward price jumps and contemporaneous volatility jumps do not necessarily have strong correlations between downward price jumps and contemporaneous volatility jumps. For most firms the relation is asymmetric. Comparing the discontinuous leverage estimates across firms, the left panel of Figure 6 indicates that firms with relatively strong discontinuous leverage estimates for positive price jumps also display relatively strong discontinuous leverage estimates for negative price jumps.

To investigate the cross-sectional heterogeneity, we ask the extent to which cross-sectional variation in financial-leverage variables explain the cross-section of discontinuous leverage estimates. We regress the discontinuous leverage and correlation estimates for market-wide upward and downward price jumps on firms' debt-to-equity ratios and the level of volatility.⁹ We include other firm characteristics, such as firm size, the book-to-market ratio, the book value of equity, profit, the cash-income ratio, the price-earnings ratio, and the number of trades to control for other influences. Compustat provides firm characteristics; we average characteristics and trades over the 2010-2015 sample before using them in the cross-sectional regression.

The first two rows in Table 5 show the debt-to-equity ratio does not significantly influence the cross-sectional variation in the discontinuous leverage estimates. However, row 4 of Table 5 shows that firms with a higher debt-to-equity ratio have a significantly stronger correlation of negative market-wide price-volatility cojumps. An increase in the debt-to-equity ratio of 10 percentage points decreases the negative correlation of price and volatility cojumps by 0.04.

⁹The volatility level is considered as a component of financial leverage; see Bandi and Renò (2012) for example.

Table 5: Regressions with discontinuous leverage estimates and correlations.

Dependent variable	Explanatory variables				R^2
	Debt-to-equity	Vola level	Size	# Trades	
Leverage $\widehat{[X, \sigma^2]}_T^d$					
· Positive price jumps	$-0.733^\dagger$ (0.41)	0.045 (0.00)	$-1.590^\ddagger$ (0.69)	$0.394^\ddagger$ (0.10)	0.15
· Negative price jumps	$0.133^\dagger$ (0.81)	-0.032 (0.00)	$-1.570^\ddagger$ (0.52)	$-9.390^\ddagger$ (0.52)	0.16
Correlation $Corr(\Delta X, \Delta \sigma^2)$					
· Positive price jumps	-0.065 (0.69)	-634.3 (0.00)	$0.339^\dagger$ (0.96)	$-2.280^\dagger$ (0.96)	0.10
· Negative price jumps	-0.386 (0.02)	572.2 (0.01)	$2.330^\dagger$ (0.74)	-94.60 [†] (0.03)	0.11

Notes: Regressions refer to the market-wide jumps. $^\dagger := \times 10^{-7}$, $^\ddagger := \times 10^{-11}$. p -values in parentheses. Cross-sectional regressions include further firm characteristics (not shown). Sample of 215 firms.

In contrast to the debt-to-equity ratio, the regressions show that the level of integrated volatility consistently explains the cross-sectional variation in discontinuous leverage across specifications. Firms with higher integrated volatility have larger discontinuous leverage (in absolute terms). In contrast to the discontinuous leverage estimates, the price-volatility cojump correlations decrease with the level of volatility. A relatively high level of volatility results in a more dispersed relation between price jumps and contemporaneous volatility jumps.

6. Conclusion

This paper makes both methodological and empirical contributions to the literature on contemporaneous price and volatility jumps. We propose a nonparametric estimator of the discontinuous leverage effect in high-frequency data that is robust to the presence of market microstructure noise. The new estimator allows us to study transactions data from the order book without down-sampling to a lower, regular observation frequency. We document the estimator’s superior asymptotic and finite sample qualities compared to a method with pre-average jump-size estimation.

Previous research has found it difficult to empirically document a discontinuous leverage effect. Studying contemporaneous price and volatility jumps of 320 individual NASDAQ stocks from 2010 to 2015, we also find mixed and mostly insignificant, unconditional discontinuous leverage effects with all detected price and volatility cojumps. We show that the event-specific nature and distinct sources of jumps obscure the true relation between price and contemporaneous volatility jumps. We establish that a strong and significant discontinuous leverage effect exists by conditioning on the sign of price jumps and on whether the price jumps are market-wide or idiosyncratic.

The discontinuous leverage effect is fundamentally different than its continuous counterpart, which was studied by Kalnina and Xiu (2017) and Ait-Sahalia et al. (2017), for example. First, in line with the asset pricing model of Pástor and Veronesi (2012, 2013), a negative correlation between price and volatility cojumps across stocks exists only for market-wide downward price jumps. The price-volatility cojump correlation is consistently positive for

market-wide upward price jumps. Second, financial leverage, measured by a firm’s debt-to-equity ratio, only explains price-volatility cojump correlations for negative market-wide jumps. Firms with a higher debt-to-equity ratio have less correlated price-volatility cojumps.

Our findings have implications for the parametric modeling of asset prices. Our empirical results cast doubt on the unconditional bivariate normality assumption of Bandi and Renò (2016), which implies tail independence and a generally linear relation around the center of the price-volatility cojump distribution. On the contrary, our results indicate that price-volatility cojumps around the center of the joint jump distribution—i.e. smaller jumps—are usually only weakly related, while jumps of the upper and the lower quantiles exhibit a strong and significant discontinuous leverage effect. The linear dependence, which was introduced by Duffie et al. (2000), allows for tail dependence but imposes one linear relation for both upward and downward price jumps. A specification that combines the uncorrelatedness assumption of Broadie et al. (2007) and a price jump sign dependence as modeled by Maneesoonthorn et al. (2017) appears as a promising candidate to adequately capture jump sizes of contemporaneous price and volatility cojumps. Working out the pricing implications of such a parametric model might be a possible path for future research.

Finally, one would like to explore the cross-sectional and time series dimension of the estimated discontinuous leverage in more detail. Since we discovered a significant link with the level of integrated volatility, it is natural to ask if an asset pricing framework, such as that in Cremers et al. (2015), prices discontinuous leverage.

References

- Aït-Sahalia, Y., Fan, J., Laeven, R.J.A., Wang, C.D. and Yang, X. (2017) *Estimation of the continuous and discontinuous leverage effect*, forthcoming in Journal of the American Statistical Association.
- Aït-Sahalia, Y., Fan, J. and Li, Y. (2013) *The leverage effect puzzle: Disentangling sources of bias at high frequency*, Journal of Financial Economics 109, 224–249.
- Ang, A., Hodrick, R.J., Xing, Y. and Zhang, X. (2006) *The cross-section of volatility and expected returns*, Journal of Finance 61, 259–299.
- Bandi, F.M. and Renò, R. (2012) *Time-varying leverage effects*, Journal of Econometrics 169, 94–113.
- Bandi, F.M. and Renò, R. (2016) *Price and volatility co-jumps*, Journal of Financial Economics 119, 107–146.
- Bekaert, G. and Wu, G. (2000) *Asymmetric volatility and risk in equity markets*, Review of Financial Studies 13, 1–42.
- Benjamini, Y. and Hochberg, Y. (1995) *Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing*, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B 57, 289–300.
- Bibinger, M., Hautsch, N., Malec, P. and Reiß, M. (2014) *Estimating the quadratic covariation matrix from noisy observations: Local method of moments and efficiency*, Annals of Statistics 42, 80–114.
- Bibinger, M. and Winkelmann, L. (2015) *Econometrics of cojumps in high-frequency data with noise*, Journal of Econometrics 184, 361–378.

- Bibinger, M. and Winkelmann, L. (2016) *Common price and volatility jumps in noisy high-frequency data*, preprint.
- Bollerslev, T., Litvinova, J. and Tauchen, G. (2006) *Leverage and volatility feedback effects in high-frequency data*, Journal of Financial Econometrics 4, 353–384.
- Black, F. (1976) *Studies of Stock Price Volatility Changes*, Proceedings of the 1976 Meeting of the American Statistical Association, Business and Economic Statistics, 6, 177–181.
- Broadie, M., Chernov, M. and Johannes, M. (2007) *Model specification and risk premia: Evidence from futures options*, Journal of Finance 62, 1453–1490.
- Chernov, M., Gallant, A.G., Ghysels, E. and Tauchen, G. (2003) *Alternative models for stock price dynamics*, Journal of Econometrics 116, 225–257.
- Christensen, K., Oomen, R. and Podolskij, M. (2014) *Fact or fiction: Jumps at ultra high frequency*, Journal of Financial Economics 114, 576–599.
- Cremers, M., Halling, M. and Weinbaum, D. (2015) *Aggregate jump and volatility risk in the cross-section of stock returns*, Journal of Finance 70, 577–614.
- Duffee, G.R. (1995) *Stock returns and volatility – A firm-level analysis*, Journal of Financial Economics 37, 399–420.
- Duffie, D., Pan, J. and Singleton, K. (2000) *Transform analysis and asset pricing for affine-diffusions*, Econometrica 68, 1343–1376.
- Eraker, B. (2004) *Do stock prices and volatility jump? Reconciling evidence from spot and option prices*, Journal of Finance 59, 1367–1403.
- Eraker, B., Johannes, M. and Polson, N. (2003) *The impact of jumps in volatility and returns*, Journal of Finance 58, 1269–1300.
- French, K.R., Schwert, W. and Stambaugh, R. (1987) *Expected Stock Returns and Volatility*, Journal of Financial Economics 19, 3–29.
- Hansen, P. R. and A. Lunde (2006). *Realized variance and market microstructure noise*. Journal of Business and Economic Statistics 24, 127–161.
- Jacod, J., Klüppelberg, C. and Müller, G. (2017) *Testing for non-correlation between price and volatility jumps*, Journal of Econometrics 197, 284–297.
- Jacod, J. and Protter, P. (2012). *Discretization of processes*, Springer.
- Kalnina, I. and Xiu, D. (2017) *Nonparametric estimation of the leverage effect: A trade-off between robustness and efficiency*, forthcoming in Journal of the American Statistical Association.
- Lahaye, J., Laurent, S. and Neely, C.J. (2011) *Jumps, cojumps and macro announcements*, Journal of Applied Econometrics 26, 893–921.
- Lee, S. and Mykland, P.A. (2008) *Jumps in financial markets: A new nonparametric test and jump dynamics*, Review of Financial Studies 21, 2535–2563.
- Lee, S. and Mykland, P.A. (2012) *Jumps in equilibrium prices and market microstructure noise*, Journal of Econometrics 168, 396–406.
- Maneesoonthorn, W., Forbes, C.S. and Martin, G.M. (2017) *Inference on self-exciting jumps in prices and volatility using high frequency measures*, Journal of Applied Econometrics 32, 504–532.

- Mykland, P.A. and Zhang, L. (2016) *Between data cleaning and inference: Pre-averaging and robust estimators of the efficient price*, Journal of Econometrics 194, 242–262.
- Pástor, L. and Veronesi, P. (2012) *Uncertainty about government policy and stock prices*, Journal of Finance 67, 1219–1264.
- Pástor, L. and Veronesi, P. (2013) *Political uncertainty and risk premia*, Journal of Financial Economics 110, 520–545.
- Reiß, M. (2011) *Asymptotic equivalence for inference on the volatility from noisy observations*, Annals of Statistics 39, 772–802.
- Todorov, V. and Tauchen, G. (2011) *Volatility jumps*, Journal of Business and Economic Statistics 29, 356–371.
- Veronesi, P. (2000) *How does information quality affect stock returns?*, Journal of Finance 55, 807–837.
- Vetter, M. (2012) *Estimation of correlation for continuous semimartingales*, Scandinavian Journal of Statistics 39, 757–771.
- Wang, C.D. and Mykland, P.A. (2014) *The estimation of the leverage effect with high-frequency data*, Journal of the American Statistical Association, 197–215.
- Winkelmann, L., Bibinger, M. and Linzert, T. (2016) *ECB monetary policy surprises: Identification through cojumps in interest rates*, Journal of Applied Econometrics 31, 613–629.
- Yu, J. (2012) *A semiparametric stochastic volatility model*, Journal of Econometrics 167, 473–482.
- Zhang, L. (2006) *Efficient estimation of stochastic volatility using noisy observations: A multi-scale approach*, Bernoulli 12(6), 1019–1043.

Appendix. Proofs

Standard localization techniques allow us to assume that there exists a constant Λ , such that

$$\max \{ |b_s(\omega)|, |\sigma_s(\omega)|, |X_s(\omega)|, |\delta_\omega(s, x)|/\gamma(x) \} \leq \Lambda,$$

for all $(\omega, s, x) \in (\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$; i.e., characteristics are uniformly bounded. We refer to Jacod and Protter (2012), Section 4.4.1, for a proof.

A.1. Proof of Proposition 3.1

We decompose the observations $Y_{t_i^n}$ in signal $X_{t_i^n}$ and noise $\epsilon_{t_i^n}$. In order to analyze the discretization variance from the signal terms, an illustration of the pre-processed price estimates (8) as a function in the efficient log-returns $\Delta_i^n X$ is helpful. Reordering addends similar as in the proofs of Zhang (2006), we obtain the identity

$$\begin{aligned} M_n^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=l}^{l+M_n-1} Y_{t_i^n} - \sum_{i=l-M_n}^{l-1} Y_{t_i^n} \right) &= M_n^{-1} \sum_{i=l}^{l+M_n-1} (Y_{t_i^n} - Y_{t_{i-M_n}^n}) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{M_n-1} \Delta_{l+k}^n Y \frac{M_n - k}{M_n} + \sum_{k=0}^{M_n-1} \Delta_{l-k}^n Y \frac{M_n - k}{M_n}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

The variance of noise terms is readily derived using the left-hand side of (A.1) and the fact that $\epsilon_{t_i^n}$ is i.i.d. with mean zero and variance η^2 . For the signal part, we exploit the above identity and consider the right-hand side of (A.1). Considering the drift part in the pre-processed price estimates (8), we can bound the right-hand side above by

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^{M_n-1} \Delta_{l+k}^n b \frac{M_n - k}{M_n} + \sum_{k=0}^{M_n-1} \Delta_{l-k}^n b \frac{M_n - k}{M_n} \right| \leq K M_n n^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/4}),$$

$\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely with generic constant K , using that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{M_n-1} (1 - k/M_n) + \sum_{k=0}^{M_n-1} (1 - k/M_n) = M_n.$$

Decompose the signal process $X_t = \int_0^t b_s ds + C_t + J_t$ into its jump component, $(J_t)_{t \geq 0}$, and the continuous Itô semi-martingale, $(C_t)_{t \geq 0}$. On Assumption 2 and for $r \geq 1$, we can use the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \forall s, t \geq 0 : \mathbb{E}[|J_t - J_s|^p | \mathcal{F}_s] &\leq K_p \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\gamma^r(x) \wedge 1) \lambda(dx) ds\right)^{1/r}\right] \\ &\leq K_p |t - s|^{(1/r)} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

to find that the jump terms in the right-hand side of (A.1) satisfy on H_0 :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\sum_{k=1}^{M_n-1} \Delta_{l+k}^n J \frac{M_n - k}{M_n} + \sum_{k=0}^{M_n-1} \Delta_{l-k}^n J \frac{M_n - k}{M_n}\right|\right] &\leq K \sum_{k=-M_n+1}^{M_n-1} \mathbb{E}[|\Delta_{l+k}^n J|] \\ &\leq M_n n^{-1/r} \end{aligned}$$

with some $r < 4/3$ and thus the terms multiplied with $n^{1/4}$ tend to zero in probability by Markov's inequality. In case that $t_i^n = i/n$, by Itô isometry and the smoothness of the volatility granted by (3) and (4), we get for $l = \lfloor \tau n \rfloor$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\Delta_{l+k}^n C)^2 | \mathcal{F}_\tau] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{(l+k-1)/n}^{(l+k)/n} \sigma_s^2 ds | \mathcal{F}_\tau\right] + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-2}) \\ &= \frac{\sigma_\tau^2}{n} + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1} \sqrt{M_n/n}), \end{aligned}$$

for all $k = 0, \dots, M_n - 1$. Analogously, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}[(\Delta_{l-k}^n C)^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\tau-M_n/n}] = \frac{\sigma_{\tau-M_n/n}^2}{n} + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1} \sqrt{M_n/n}),$$

for all $k = 1, \dots, M_n - 1$. Use of the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{M_n-1} (1 - k/M_n)^2 &= \frac{1}{3} M_n + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6} M_n^{-1}, \\ \sum_{k=1}^{M_n-1} (1 - k/M_n)^2 &= \frac{1}{3} M_n - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6} M_n^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and the independence of the noise and signal terms yields the asymptotic variance,

$$\mathbb{V}\text{ar}(\sqrt{M_n} T^{LM}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y)) \rightarrow \frac{1}{3}(\sigma_\tau^2 + \sigma_{\tau-}^2) c^2 + 2\eta^2,$$

of the rescaled test statistic on the hypothesis H_0 . The form of the variance in (9) follows from the above. Because the expectation of the martingale part vanishes,

$$\mathbb{E}[T^{LM}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y)] = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/4})$$

on H_0 . Using that

$$\mathbb{E}[(\Delta_{l+k}^n C)^4 | \mathcal{F}_\tau] = \frac{3\sigma_\tau^4}{n^2} + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-2})$$

and with the assumed existence of $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_t^4]$, the Lyapunov criterion with fourth moments obtained from (A.1) yields, together with the above considerations, the central limit theorem (9).

Under the alternative H_1 , the price jump at time τ induces a different expectation. By the decomposition

$$M_n^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=l}^{l+M_n-1} Y_{t_i^n} - \sum_{i=l-M_n}^{l-1} Y_{t_i^n} \right) = \sum_{k=1}^{M_n-1} \Delta_{l+k}^n Y \frac{M_n - k}{M_n} + \sum_{k=1}^{M_n-1} \Delta_{l-k}^n Y \frac{M_n - k}{M_n} + \Delta_l^n Y$$

with $l = \lfloor \tau n \rfloor$, and applying the estimates above to the two sums on the right-hand side, we conclude that under H_1

$$\mathbb{E}[T^{LM}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) | \Delta X_\tau] = \Delta X_\tau + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/4}).$$

Because

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{k=1}^{M_n-1} \Delta_{l+k}^n J \frac{M_n - k}{M_n} + \sum_{k=1}^{M_n-1} \Delta_{l-k}^n J \frac{M_n - k}{M_n} \right| \right] \leq M_n n^{-1/r} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/4})$$

by (A.2), the first-order asymptotic variance remains as on H_0 . No additional cross terms appear in the asymptotic variance here, which makes it different from the estimation of quadratic variation under jumps.

Next, we prove that the convergence is stable in law. The latter is equivalent to the joint weak convergence of $\alpha_n = \sqrt{M_n} T^{LM}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y)$ with any $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable bounded random variable Z :

$$\mathbb{E}[Zg(\alpha_n)] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[Zg(\alpha)] = \mathbb{E}[Z]\mathbb{E}[g(\alpha)] \quad (\text{A.3})$$

for any continuous bounded function g and

$$\alpha = (1/3(\sigma_\tau^2 + \sigma_{\tau-}^2)c^2 + 2\eta^2)^{1/2} U, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

with U a standard normally distributed random variable that is independent of $\mathcal{G}$. In order

to verify (A.3), consider the sequence $A_n = [(\tau - M_n/n) \vee 0, (\tau + M_n/n) \wedge 1]$. Each α_n is measurable with respect to the σ -field $\mathcal{G}_1$. The sequence of decompositions

$$\tilde{C}(n)_t = \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{A_n}(s) \sigma_s dW_s, \quad \bar{C}(n)_t = C_t - \tilde{C}(n)_t,$$

$$\bar{\epsilon}(n)_t = \mathbb{1}_{A_n}(t) \epsilon_t, \quad \bar{\epsilon}(n)_t = \epsilon_t - \tilde{\epsilon}(n)_t,$$

of $(C_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(\epsilon_t)_{t \geq 0}$ are well-defined. If $\mathcal{H}_n$ denotes the σ -field generated by $\bar{C}(n)_t$, $\bar{\epsilon}(n)_t$ and $\mathcal{F}_0$, then $(\mathcal{H}_n)_n$ is an isotonic sequence with $\bigvee_n \mathcal{H}_n = \mathcal{G}_1$. Since $\mathbb{E}[Z|\mathcal{H}_n] \rightarrow Z$ in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$, it thus suffices that

$$\mathbb{E}[Zg(\alpha_n)] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[Zg(\alpha)] = \mathbb{E}[Z]\mathbb{E}[g(\alpha)] \quad (\text{A.5})$$

for Z being $\mathcal{H}_q$ measurable for some q . Note that we can approximate the volatility locally constant over intervals $[\tau - M_n/n, \tau]$ and $[\tau, \tau + M_n/n]$. Then for all $n \geq q$, conditional on $\mathcal{H}_q$, α_n has a law independent of $\bar{C}(n)_t$ and $\bar{\epsilon}(n)_t$, such that the ordinary central limit theorem implies the claimed convergence.

A.2. Proof of Proposition 3.2

A neat decomposition of the spectral statistics into observation errors and returns of the efficient price is obtained with *summation by parts*

$$S_j(\tau) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i^n X \Phi_{j,\tau}((t_{i-1}^n + t_i^n)/2) - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \epsilon_{t_i^n} \Phi'_{j,\tau}(t_i^n) \frac{t_{i+1}^n - t_{i-1}^n}{2} \right) (1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where the asymptotically negligible remainder comes from approximating $\Phi_{j,\tau}((t_{i+1}^n + t_i^n)/2) - \Phi_{j,\tau}((t_{i-1}^n + t_i^n)/2)$ with the derivative and end-effects. The system of derivatives $(\Phi'_{j,\tau})_{j \geq 1}$ is again orthogonal such that covariances between different spectral frequencies vanish.

First, we prove that the drift is asymptotically negligible under Assumption 1. Because $\int_0^1 \Phi_{j,\tau}(t) dt = 2\sqrt{2h_n}/(\pi j)$ and $\int_0^1 |\Phi_{j,\tau}(t)| dt = 2\sqrt{2h_n}/\pi$, we get with generic constant K that $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i^n b \Phi_{j,\tau}((t_{i-1}^n + t_i^n)/2) \right| \leq K \sum_{i=1}^n (t_i^n - t_{i-1}^n) |\Phi_{j,\tau}((t_{i-1}^n + t_i^n)/2)| \leq K \frac{\sqrt{h_n}}{\pi},$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} (-1)^{j+1} a_{2j-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i^n b \Phi_{j,\tau}((t_{i-1}^n + t_i^n)/2) \right| &\leq K \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} (1 + j^2 h_n^{-2}/n)^{-1} \sqrt{h_n} \\ &= K \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} \left(1 + \frac{j^2}{\log^2(n)} \right)^{-1} \sqrt{h_n} \\ &\leq K \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\log(n)} \sqrt{h_n} + \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} j^{-2} \sqrt{h_n} \log^2(n) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq K \log^2(n) \sqrt{h_n}.$$

This yields that $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely

$$n^{1/4} \sqrt{\frac{h_n}{2}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} (-1)^{j+1} a_{2j-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i^n b \Phi_{j,\tau}((t_{i-1}^n + t_i^n)/2) \right| \rightarrow 0,$$

which ensures that we can neglect the drift in the asymptotic analysis of (13).

Next, we analyze the variance of (13) on H_0 with oracle optimal weights (14). A locally constant approximation of $\sigma_s, s \in [\tau - h_n/2, \tau)$ and $\sigma_s, s \in [\tau, \tau + h_n/2]$ is on Assumption 1 asymptotically negligible. Based on (A.6), using that

$$\int_{\tau-h_n/2}^{\tau} \Phi_{j,\tau}^2(t) dt = \int_{\tau}^{\tau+h_n/2} \Phi_{j,\tau}^2(t) dt = 1/2$$

yields the following generalization of the variances of spectral statistics

$$\mathbb{V}\text{ar}(S_j(\tau)) = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{\tau}^2 + \sigma_{\tau-}^2) + \frac{\pi^2 j^2 \eta^2}{h_n^2 n}.$$

We thus obtain the conditional variance

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{V}\text{ar}\left(n^{1/4} \mathcal{T}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) | \mathcal{F}_{\tau}\right) \\ &= n^{1/2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n} \left(\frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{\tau}^2 + \sigma_{\tau-}^2) + \pi^2 (2j-1)^2 h_n^{-2} n^{-1} \eta^2 \right)^{-1} \right)^{-1} h_n/2 + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{J_n} \left(\frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{\tau}^2 + \sigma_{\tau-}^2) + \pi^2 (2j-1)^2 h_n^{-2} n^{-1} \eta^2 \right)^{-1}}{\log(n)} \right)^{-1} + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{\tau}^2 + \sigma_{\tau-}^2) + \pi^2 (2z)^2 \eta^2} dz \right)^{-1} (1 + \mathcal{O}(1)) + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= 2 \left(\frac{\sigma_{\tau}^2 + \sigma_{\tau-}^2}{2} \right)^{1/2} \eta + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Considering the jumps on the estimation window, utilizing (A.2) yields on H_0

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} (-1)^{j+1} a_{2j-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i^n J \Phi_{j,\tau}((t_{i-1}^n + t_i^n)/2) \right| \right] \leq K \log^2(n) \sqrt{h_n} \sup_i |t_i^n - t_{i-1}^n|^{1/r-1}$$

by triangle inequality, decomposing $|t_i^n - t_{i-1}^n|^{1/r} = (t_i^n - t_{i-1}^n) |t_i^n - t_{i-1}^n|^{1/r-1}$ and using the same Riemann sum approximation as for the drift terms above. As for the Lee-Mykland statistic, $r < 4/3$ ensures asymptotic negligibility of (further) jumps on $[\tau - h_n/2, \tau + h_n/2]$.

Since we assume $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_t^4] < \infty$, we can establish a Lyapunov condition with fourth moments. Integral approximations with $\int_0^1 \Phi_{j,\tau}^4(t) dt$ and $\int_0^1 (\Phi'_{j,\tau})^4(t) dt$ yield with generic constant C for all j

$$n \frac{h_n^2}{4} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(\Delta_i^n X)^4] \Phi_{j,\tau}^4((t_{i-1}^n + t_i^n)/2) \leq C n h_n^2 n^{-1} \frac{3}{2} h_n^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(h_n)$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} n \frac{h_n^2}{4} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(\epsilon_{t_i^n}^4)(\Phi'_{j,\tau})^4(t_i^n)(t_{i+1}^n - t_{i-1}^n)^4/16] &\leq C n h_n^2 h_n^{-5} n^{-3} \log^5(n) \\ &\leq C n^{-1/2} \log^2(n). \end{aligned}$$

Considering signal and noise terms separately, we derive for the signal terms with Jensen's inequality for weighted sums

$$\begin{aligned} &n \frac{h_n^2}{4} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\Delta_i^n X \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} (-1)^{j+1} a_{2j-1} \Phi_{2j-1,\tau}((t_{i-1}^n + t_i^n)/2) \right)^4 \right] \\ &\leq n \frac{h_n^2}{4} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(\Delta_i^n X)^4] \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} a_{2j-1}^4 \Phi_{2j-1,\tau}^4((t_{i-1}^n + t_i^n)/2) \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n} a_{2j-1} h_n \right) = \mathcal{O}(h_n). \end{aligned}$$

An analogous bound by Jensen's inequality for the noise terms implies the Lyapunov condition. With $\delta_n \leq n^{-1}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{T}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) | \Delta X_\tau] \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{h_n}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} a_{2j-1} (-1)^{j+1} \Phi_{2j-1,\tau}(\tau + \delta_n) \mathbb{E}[\Delta_l^n Y | \Delta X_\tau] + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/4}) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{h_n}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} a_{2j-1} (-1)^{j+1} \Phi_{2j-1,\tau}(\tau + \delta_n) \Delta X_\tau + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/4}) \\ &= (1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta_n)) \Delta X_\tau + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/4}). \end{aligned}$$

Under H_0 , (16) follows. Under the alternative H_1 , $\mathcal{T}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y)$ consistently estimates the jump with the same variance as on H_0 .

Stability of weak convergence is proved along the same lines as for Proposition 3.1 and we omit the proof. It remains to show that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} (-1)^{j+1} (\hat{a}_{2j-1} - a_{2j-1}) S_{2j-1}(\tau) \sqrt{h_n/2} \right| \right] = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/4}) \quad (\text{A.7})$$

when $\hat{a}_{2j-1}$ denote the estimated oracle weights, to prove the claimed result. Using triangle and Hölder's inequalities, we can bound the right-hand side of (A.7) by

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^{J_n} \mathbb{E} \left[|\hat{a}_{2j-1} - a_{2j-1}| |S_{2j-1}(\tau)| \right] \sqrt{\frac{h_n}{2}} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} \left(\mathbb{E} [|\hat{a}_{2j-1} - a_{2j-1}|^2] \mathbb{E} [|S_{2j-1}(\tau)|^2] \right)^{1/2} \sqrt{\frac{h_n}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to analyze the magnitude of the error of pre-estimating the weights, $|\hat{a}_{2j-1} - a_{2j-1}|^2$,

we interpret (14) as a function of the variables σ_τ^2 , $\sigma_{\tau-}^2$ and η^2 . Differential calculus and the delta method yield the upper bound,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} K \left(a_{2j-1}^2 (\delta_n(\sigma_\tau^2) + \delta_n(\eta^2))^2 \text{Var}(S_{2j-1}(\tau)) \right)^{1/2} \sqrt{h_n/2} \\ & \leq \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} K \delta_n(\sigma_\tau^2) \frac{(\text{Var}(S_{2j-1}(\tau)))^{-1/2}}{\sum_{u=1}^{J_n} (\text{Var}(S_{2u-1}(\tau)))^{-1}} \sqrt{h_n/2} \\ & \leq \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} K \left(1 + \frac{j^2}{\log^2(n)} \right)^{-1/2} \delta_n(\sigma_\tau^2) \sqrt{h_n/2} = \mathcal{O}(\log^3(n) \delta_n(\sigma_\tau^2) \sqrt{h_n}) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/4}), \end{aligned}$$

for the right-hand side of (A.7) with generic constant K and bounds $\delta_n(\sigma_\tau^2) \leq K n^{-1/8}$ and $\delta_n(\eta^2) \leq K n^{-1/2}$ for the errors of pre-estimating σ_τ^2 , $\sigma_{\tau-}^2$ and η^2 with (15a) and (15b), respectively. This ensures (A.7) and completes the proof of Proposition 3.2.

A.3. Proof of Proposition 3.3

The proof reduces to generalizing the analysis of the asymptotic variance and fourth moments for a Lyapunov condition. Consider the noise term on the right-hand side of (A.6) under R -dependent noise and for $t_i^n = F^{-1}(i/n)$. The expectation still vanishes and the variance becomes the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \epsilon_{t_i^n} \Phi'_{j,\tau}(t_i^n) \frac{t_{i+1}^n - t_{i-1}^n}{2} \right)^2 \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \epsilon_{t_i^n}^2 (\Phi'_{j,\tau}(t_i^n))^2 \left(\frac{t_{i+1}^n - t_{i-1}^n}{2} \right)^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{u=1}^{R \wedge (n-i)} \epsilon_{t_i^n} \epsilon_{t_{i+u}^n} \Phi'_{j,\tau}(t_i^n) \Phi'_{j,\tau}(t_{i+u}^n) \frac{t_{i+1}^n - t_{i-1}^n}{2} \frac{t_{i+u+1}^n - t_{i+u-1}^n}{2} \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (\Phi'_{j,\tau}(t_i^n))^2 \frac{t_{i+1}^n - t_{i-1}^n}{2} (F^{-1})'(\tau) n^{-1} \left(\epsilon_{t_i^n}^2 + \sum_{u=1}^{R \wedge (n-i)} \epsilon_{t_i^n} \epsilon_{t_{i+u}^n} \right) \right] (1 + \mathcal{O}(1)) \\ & = \eta_\tau^2 (F^{-1})'(\tau) n^{-1} \int_0^1 \Phi'_{j,\tau}(t) dt (1 + \mathcal{O}(1)) = \eta^2 (F^{-1})'(\tau) n^{-1} \pi^2 j^2 h_n^{-2} (1 + \mathcal{O}(1)). \end{aligned}$$

We used the smoothness of $(F^{-1})'$ and $\Phi'_{j,\tau}$ for approximations. The same Riemann sum approximation as in the equidistant observations case applies for the signal term. Using a (double Riemann sum) integral approximation as $J_n \rightarrow \infty$, analogously as in the proof of Proposition 3.2, yields the asymptotic variance in (20). Introducing the shortcut, $\delta_{i,v}^R = \mathbb{1}_{\{|i-v| \leq R\}}$, we obtain the following estimates for the fourth moments:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \epsilon_{t_i^n} \Phi'_{j,\tau}(t_i^n) \frac{t_{i+1}^n - t_{i-1}^n}{2} \right)^4 \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i,v,u,r=1}^{n-1} \epsilon_{t_i^n} \epsilon_{t_v^n} \epsilon_{t_u^n} \epsilon_{t_r^n} \Phi'_{j,\tau}(t_i^n) \Phi'_{j,\tau}(t_v^n) \Phi'_{j,\tau}(t_u^n) \Phi'_{j,\tau}(t_r^n) \frac{t_{i+1}^n - t_{i-1}^n}{2} \frac{t_{v+1}^n - t_{v-1}^n}{2} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \frac{t_{u+1}^n - t_{u-1}^n}{2} \frac{t_{r+1}^n - t_{r-1}^n}{2} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i,v,u,r=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} [\epsilon_{t_i^n} \epsilon_{t_v^n} \epsilon_{t_u^n} \epsilon_{t_r^n}] (\delta_{i,v}^R \delta_{u,r}^R + \delta_{i,u}^R \delta_{v,r}^R + \delta_{i,r}^R \delta_{v,u}^R) \Phi'_{j,\tau}(t_i^n) \Phi'_{j,\tau}(t_v^n) \\
&\quad \times \Phi'_{j,\tau}(t_u^n) \Phi'_{j,\tau}(t_r^n) \frac{t_{i+1}^n - t_{i-1}^n}{2} \frac{t_{v+1}^n - t_{v-1}^n}{2} \frac{t_{u+1}^n - t_{u-1}^n}{2} \frac{t_{r+1}^n - t_{r-1}^n}{2} \\
&= ((F^{-1}(\tau))')^2 3 \eta_\tau^4 n^{-2} - R_n,
\end{aligned}$$

with a remainder R_n , which satisfies for some constant C that

$$\begin{aligned}
R_n &\lesssim \sum_{i,v,u,r=1}^{n_p} C \left(\delta_{i,v}^R \delta_{u,r}^R (\delta_{i,u}^R + \delta_{v,r}^R + \delta_{i,r}^R + \delta_{v,u}^R) + \delta_{i,u}^R \delta_{v,r}^R (\delta_{i,v}^R + \delta_{u,r}^R + \delta_{i,r}^R + \delta_{v,u}^R) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \delta_{i,r}^R \delta_{v,u}^R (\delta_{i,v}^R + \delta_{u,r}^R + \delta_{i,u}^R + \delta_{v,r}^R) \right) n^{-4} \\
&= \mathcal{O}(n R^3 n^{-4}) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-3}) = o(n^{-2}),
\end{aligned}$$

such that R_n is asymptotically negligible. Inserting the estimate, the Lyapunov condition is ensured in the generalized setting. Under R -dependence, the convergence of the generalized variance and the generalized Lyapunov criterion imply the central limit theorem (20) and stability is proved completely analogously as above.

A.4. Proof of Proposition 3.5

Cutting out a time window $(t_{l-l_n}^n, t_{l+r_n}^n)$ around τ , where a jump arrival can not be located more precisely, the Lee-Mykland statistics from (A.1) generalize

$$\begin{aligned}
&M_n^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=l+r_n}^{l+r_n+M_n-1} Y_{t_i^n} - \sum_{i=l-l_n-M_n}^{l-l_n-1} Y_{t_i^n} \right) \\
&= \sum_{k=r_n+1}^{r_n+M_n-1} \Delta_{l+k}^n Y \frac{M_n + r_n - k}{M_n} + \sum_{k=l_n+1}^{l_n+M_n-1} \Delta_{l-k}^n Y \frac{M_n + l_n - k}{M_n} + (Y_{t_{l+r_n}^n} - Y_{t_{l-l_n}^n}) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{M_n-1} \Delta_{l+k+r_n}^n Y \frac{M_n - k}{M_n} + \sum_{k=1}^{M_n-1} \Delta_{l-l_n-k}^n Y \frac{M_n - k}{M_n} + (Y_{t_{l+r_n}^n} - Y_{t_{l-l_n}^n}).
\end{aligned}$$

The statistic is an unbiased estimator of ΔX_τ . The variance due to noise in the i.i.d. case is not changed by cutting out the window $(t_{l-l_n}^n, t_{l+r_n}^n)$. In case of autocorrelated noise, the constant (not the asymptotic order) could slightly change, since instead of two neighbored bins we consider two bins with some gap between them. The variance by discretization remains of the same order when $(t_{l-l_n}^n, t_{l+r_n}^n) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$ as well, but the constant increases if $(t_{l-l_n}^n, t_{l+r_n}^n) \propto n^{-1/2}$. Using the decomposition above, we can exploit all considerations from the proof of Proposition 3.1 for the two sums. The signal part of the last addend right-hand side above has a variance

$$\text{Var}(C_{t_{l+r_n}^n} - C_{t_{l-l_n}^n}) \leq C (t_{l+r_n}^n - t_{l-l_n}^n)$$

for some constant C . Still,

$$|T^{LM*}(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) - \Delta X_\tau| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/4})$$

applies to the adjusted estimator.

Cutting out noisy prices in the window $(t_{l-l_n}^n, t_{l+r_n}^n)$ around τ , the adjusted statistics (13) are unbiased estimators of ΔX_τ . Considering the asymptotic properties, we can exploit most parts of the proof of Proposition 3.2. The only relevant difference is due to the increment over the cutout window in the spectral statistics

$$\sqrt{\frac{h_n}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} (-1)^{j+1} a_{2j-1} (Y_{t_{l+r_n}^n} - Y_{t_{l-l_n}^n}) \Phi_{2j-1, \tau}(\tau).$$

The increments $Y_{t_{l+r_n}^n} - Y_{t_{l-l_n}^n}$ take the role of $\Delta_l^n Y$, $l = \lfloor \tau n \rfloor$, where the window of statistics (13) is centered. Using Jensen's inequality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sqrt{\frac{h_n}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} a_{2j-1} (-1)^{j+1} \Phi_{2j-1, \tau}(\tau) (X_{t_{l+r_n}^n} - X_{t_{l-l_n}^n}) \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq \frac{h_n}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} a_{2j-1}^2 \Phi_{2j-1, \tau}^2(\tau) \mathbb{E}[(X_{t_{l+r_n}^n} - X_{t_{l-l_n}^n})^2] \\ & \leq \max(\sigma_\tau^2, \sigma_{\tau-}^2) (t_{l+r_n}^n - t_{l-l_n}^n) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\Phi'_{2j-1, \tau}(\tau) = 0$, the summation by parts transformation (A.6) shows that the variance due to noise is not affected by the adjustment. Overall, we conclude for the adjusted estimator,

$$|\mathcal{T}^*(\tau; \Delta_1^n Y, \dots, \Delta_n^n Y) - \Delta X_\tau| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/4}).$$

Bibinger and Winkelmann (2015) present a thresholding method that allows one to locate the jump arrival times on small bins of shrinking size of order $n^{-1/2}$. It relies on the fact that in comparison to the variance of spectral statistics computed in the proof of Proposition 3.2, the squared expectation has an additional addend of order $(\Delta X_\tau)^2 h_n^{-1}$ when a jump occurs. Thus, when $h_n \rightarrow 0$, the squared spectral statistics become large and the jump can be detected by thresholding. In principle, a jump location on windows that decay faster than $n^{-1/2}$ appears possible. Choosing $(t_{l-l_n}^n, t_{l+r_n}^n) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$, however, is sufficient to preserve unbiasedness and the rate of convergence of the above price-jump size estimators.

We use a similar notation as Bibinger and Winkelmann (2016). Spectral estimators of the squared spot volatility at time s and its left limit are

$$\hat{\sigma}_s^2 = \sum_{k=\lfloor sh_n^{-1} \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor sh_n^{-1} \rfloor + r_n^{-1}} r_n \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} \hat{w}_{jk} (S_{jk}^2 - \pi^2 j^2 h_n^{-2} \frac{\hat{\eta}_{kh_n}}{n}) \mathbb{1}_{\{h_n |\zeta_k^{ad}(Y)| \leq u_n\}}, \quad (\text{A.8a})$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_{s-}^2 = \sum_{k=\lfloor sh_n^{-1} \rfloor - r_n^{-1}}^{\lfloor sh_n^{-1} \rfloor - 1} r_n \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} \hat{w}_{jk} (S_{jk}^2 - \pi^2 j^2 h_n^{-2} \frac{\hat{\eta}_{kh_n}}{n}) \mathbb{1}_{\{h_n |\zeta_k^{ad}(Y)| \leq u_n\}}. \quad (\text{A.8b})$$

Here, $\zeta_k^{ad}(Y)$ is a short notation for adaptive versions of the statistics $\zeta_k = \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} w_{jk} (S_{jk}^2 - \pi^2 j^2 h_n^{-2} \frac{\hat{\eta}_{kh_n}}{n})$. As $n \rightarrow \infty$, for $r_n^{-1} \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that $(r_n^{-1} h_n) \rightarrow 0$ slowly enough to ensure $r_n^{-1} \rightarrow \infty$.

The case $N = 0$, when there are no price jumps on the considered interval, is trivial. Thus, denote by $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_N$, $N \geq 1$ price-jump arrival times on the time interval under consideration. Consider the set

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Omega}_n = \{ & \omega \in \Omega | \tau_1 > r_n^{-1}h_n, \tau_N < 1 - r_n^{-1}h_n, \tau_i - \tau_{i-1} > 2r_n^{-1}h_n, i = 1, \dots, N-1 \} \\ & \cup \{ \omega \in \Omega | \tau_i = k \cdot h_n, i = 1, \dots, N-1, k = 0, \dots, h_n^{-1} - 1 \}^c.\end{aligned}$$

We can restrict to the subset $\tilde{\Omega}_n$, since $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Omega}_n) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The jump times $\{\tau_i, i = 1, \dots, N\}$ are estimated with thresholding by $\{\hat{\tau}_i, i = 1, \dots, \hat{N}\}$, and we have that

$$\hat{N} - N = \sum_{k=r_n^{-1}}^{h_n^{-1}-r_n^{-1}-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\Delta_k[\widehat{X}, X] > (u_n \vee a^2)\}} - \sum_{s \leq T} \mathbb{1}_{\{|\Delta X_s| > a\}}.$$

Analogously to Step 3 in the proof of Theorem 1 in Bibinger and Winkelmann (2016), we derive that substituting $\hat{\tau}_i$ for τ_i , estimating the jump arrival times with thresholding, only induces an asymptotically negligible error. To simplify notation, let us write $\tau_i, i = 1, \dots, \hat{N}$ in the sequel for the estimated τ_i . Because we can locate the bins with price jumps correctly asymptotically with probability 1, we can suppose that both coincide.

On $\tilde{\Omega}_n$, all involved local estimates for different estimated price-jump times $\tau_i, i = 1, \dots, \hat{N}$, are computed from disjoint datasets. The latter are not necessarily independent, but all covariations converge to zero asymptotically. For the single estimates we have by Proposition 3.2 and the considerations for the adjusted method above, as well as Theorem 1 and Corollary 3.1 of Bibinger and Winkelmann (2016),

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\Delta X}_{\tau_i} &= \Delta X_{\tau_i} + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/4}), \\ \hat{\sigma}_{\tau_i}^2 &= \sigma_{\tau_i}^2 + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(r_n^{1/2}), \\ \hat{\sigma}_{\tau_i-}^2 &= \sigma_{\tau_i-}^2 + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(r_n^{1/2}), \\ \hat{\eta}_{\tau_i} &= \eta_{\tau_i} + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/4}).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, as shown in the proof of Theorem 2 of Bibinger and Winkelmann (2016), $\text{Cov}(\hat{\sigma}_{\tau_i}^2, \hat{\sigma}_{\tau_i-}^2) = \mathcal{O}(r_n^{1/2})$. Furthermore, for all i

$$r_n^{-1/2}(\hat{\sigma}_{\tau_i}^2 - \hat{\sigma}_{\tau_i-}^2) \xrightarrow{(st)} \sqrt{8\sigma_{\tau_i}^3 \eta_{\tau_i}} Z_{\tau_i} + \sqrt{8\sigma_{\tau_i-}^3 \eta_{\tau_i}} Z_{\tau_i-}$$

with two independent standard normal random variables $(Z_{\tau_i}, Z_{\tau_i-})$. By the asymptotic negligibility of covariations, the vector converges stably in law

$$r_n^{-1/2}(\hat{\sigma}_{\tau_1}^2 - \hat{\sigma}_{\tau_1-}^2, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_{\tau_{\hat{N}}}^2 - \hat{\sigma}_{\tau_{\hat{N}}-}^2) \xrightarrow{(st)} (U_1, U_{1-}, \dots, U_{\hat{N}}, U_{\hat{N}-}),$$

where $U_1, \dots, U_{\hat{N}-}$ are independent and $U_i = \sqrt{8\sigma_{\tau_i}^3 \eta_{\tau_i}} Z_{\tau_i}, U_{i-} = \sqrt{8\sigma_{\tau_i-}^3 \eta_{\tau_i}} Z_{\tau_i-}$. Altogether, the asymptotic orders of different error terms and standard relations for weak and stochastic convergences imply (28). A key element for the above reasoning that leads us to Proposition 3.5 by extending our previous results and the results from Bibinger and Winkelmann (2016) is that $N < \infty$ almost surely if $r = 0$, or if we set $a > 0$.